Ruskin

Crown of Wild O

Hannah

Kitab Mahal Series of English Literature.

RUSKIN'S

CROWN OF WILD OLIVE

BY

Prof. Bashir Hussain M.A. (Alig)

(Introduction, Text, Notes)

P· ı

KITAB MAHAL

Educational Publishers

URDU BAZAR, LAHORE-2 (W. Pak.)

PUBLISED BY

Shakoor Mohammad
Manager
KITAB MAHAL, LAHORE.

★ ★ ★

PRINTED BY

Mohammad Yaqub
Ejaz Printing Press, LAHORE.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.

(1) A Brief Sketch of Ruskin's Life and Work.

(a) *1819-42: Early Influences.*

John Ruskin was born on 8th February, 1819 at 54, Hunter Street, Brunswick Square, London. His father, a Scotch wine-merchant, was a man of refined literary tastes. It was probably the example of his father that made Ruskin speak so eloquently of the nobility of a true merchant and declare: "The market may have its martyrdoms as well as the pulpit; and trade its heroisms as well as war". His mother, a devout Evangelical Christian, subjected Ruskin to severe discipline from babyhood. He was not permitted to cry. The mother punished his lapses as a baby by refusing him his legitimate share of fruit or pudding. The rare virtues of 'self-possession and self-control' were thus ingrained in him from the very beginning. Ruskin himself has narrated the story of his early years in his *Praeterita.*

Ruskin had very few companions in his boyhood and he hardly played any games. He attended a day-school and a private tutor had also been engaged to teach him. He learnt to read early enough and read for himself "the Bible, Pope's *Homer*, Scott and the great poets". Even before this, his mother used to read out to him a number of passages from the Bible. And she made him read aloud every day, with proper accents and pauses, a portion of the Holy Book when he had learned to read. Ruskin himself acknowledges the profound influence that this training had on him, in *Praeterita* Vol. I. P 52: "I have with deeper gratitude to chronicle what I owe to my mother for the resolutely consistent lessons which so exercised me in the Scriptures as to make every word of them familiar to my ear in habitual music,—yet in that familiarity reverenced, as transcending all thought, and ordaining all conduct." It is this early reading of the Bible that partly accounts for the music of his style and the nobility of his ideas.

But he also missed a great deal through the isolation of his boyhood. Fancy Ruskin preaching a sermon as a hild: "People, be dood. If you are dood, Dod will love you."! As

he himself admitted later, he led "a very small, perky, contented, conceited Cock—Robinson-Crusoe sort of life, in the central point which it appeared to me that I occupied in the universe."

He also went on several continental tours with his parents in his boyhood and during the vacations after he went up to Oxford. He travelled extensively in the British Isles and also in 'the tourist's continent.' This resulted in a genuine and life-long love of natural scenery, particularly of the mountains which he called the Cathedrals of Nature.

He went up to Christ Church, Oxford, when he was a lad of seventeen. His ill-health prevented him from reading for honours but he wrote an essay on J. M. W. Turner, the celebrated artist and he also won the Newdigate Prize for English Verse for a poem on 'Salsette and Elephanta.' He took his degree in 1841. Ruskin's father was a great admirer of Turner. Ruskin had himself mastered very early 'the brush, the knife and the chisel'. He was a good painter and a careful engraver. His continental tours had made him familiar with the beauty of castles, colleges, churches and cathedrals. Some of the paintings of Turner were exhibited at the Royal Academy Exhibition of 1836. Ruskin entered into the inner significance of these works of art as no one else had. Henceforth he was convinced that poetry was not his vocation, though he had practised verse in the nursery and at school and had written poems containing lines like the following on Coniston Crags:

"The crags are lone on Coniston
And Glaramara's dell."

He realised that his mission was to "tell the world that Art, no less than other spheres of life, had its heroes; that the mainspring of their energy was sincerity, and the burden of their utterance, Truth." He had also studied mineralogy and physical geology,—but they were only to be the "means and not the ends of his teaching." Accordingly, he came out with the first volume of *Modern Painters* in 1843, at the age of twenty four.

(*b*) 1842-60. *The Art-Critic.*

He tried to prove, in the first volume of *Modern Painters*, the

superiority of Turner in the art of landscape-painting to all the ancient masters. The remaining four volumes appeared at irregular intervals, the last appearing in 1860. In the meanwhile, Ruskin had undertaken several tours to the Alps to compare them with the scenery depicted in Turner's paintings. In 1844, when he was returning from an Alpine tour, he stopped for a few days in Paris to study the great Italian paintings in the Louvre. "He was astonished to find that these 'ancient' masters had a perfection of skill and a depth of meaning as admirable as those of Turner. Ruskin thus found himself drawn more and more to the study of Italian Art—and particularly of the religious condition of Italy which made such supreme art possible. He now visited Lucca, Pisa, Florence and Venice and ceaselessly laboured to sketch the superb architecture and paintings of these cities." The result was his magnificent interpretation of Italian Architecture in his *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, 1849 and *The Stones of Venice* in 1851 and 1853. These writings of Ruskin established his reputation as the founder of a new school of art-criticism. The chapter on the nature of Gothic in the latter was the first reasoned testament of his new faith and a clear proof of his transition from art to political economy and social reform. Many were shocked by it for they perceived that 'Ruskinism was violently inimical to sundry existing interests.' Ruskin attacked 'mechanical execution by unintelligent workmen' and 'postponed the reign of art until workmen should be artists and artists workmen.' Many of the leading thinkers and writers of the day recognised the genius of the book and Carlyle wrote that it was a "strange, unexpected and most true and excellent *Sermon* in Stones—as well as the best piece of school-mastering in Architectonics."

During this period, Ruskin also thought of popularising his interpretation of art by delivering lectures on the subject. He delivered his first series of lectures on Art in Edinburgh in November, 1854. Ruskin pleaded for the revival of Gothic architecture in these lectures and for the use of Gothic as 'a domestic style.' It was also about this time that he was interested in educating the workmen in London. The Rev. E. D. Maurice had founded the Workingmen's College in 1854 with a similar object in view. Ruskin used to teach drawing on

Thursday evenings during term-time in this institution. He did this work in an honorary capacity for four years till May 1858, and again for a term in 1860. Later he used to visit the college occasionally for delivering lectures like the one on 'work' included in the *Crown of Wild Olive.*

During all these years Ruskin continued to live with his parents. His married life was an unhappy one. He had stepped into the shoes of a lover at the age of seventeen, even before he went up to Oxford. He fell in love with Adele, the French daughter of his father's partner in business and courted her with his poems and plays but without evoking any response in her heart. He married Euphemia Chalmers Gray, a lady of great beauty, in 1848. But there were no temperamental affinities between the two. Their married life was a prolonged misery and the lady broke off from Ruskin and married Millais, the Pre-Raphaelite artist, in 1855.

For many years to come, Ruskin was in request as a lecturer at various places,—Manchester, Tunbridge Wells, Woolwich, South Kensington, Eton, Oxford, Cambridge and several private schools for girls. He dealt apparently with the great theme of Art, but the drift of his lectures always pointed to the Art of Life. This was only to be expected from the peculiar upbringing that was his. "Unlike many men of genius," says Laurence Binyon, "he had no hard and rough experience of youth. He was bred strictly, yet with a choice luxury in his surroundings. And with his extreme sensitiveness to beauty, combined with what by no means accompanies it, an exquisite faculty of precise observation and acute powers of reasoning, what luck and opportunity were his! Much travel had given him a sense of Europe and of history, besides storing his mind with vivid impressions; without that he could not have perceived so poignantly the ignobleness of industrial England, and in especial, its private sumptuousness contrasted with its public meanness." This contrast between the luxury of the rich and the degradation of the poor was borne in upon him by his contact with the working-men in London and effected the transition in his life from Art to Political Economy and Social Reform. He observed in a lecture delivered about this time (April, 1857) at St. Martin's

London was painting cheeks red with health."

Ruskin taught his generation, by word of pen and mouth, the value of art as a means of education and the distinction between 'artistic decoration and machine-made wares.' He was no mere sentimental theorist. He worked day and night for the cause which he adopted as his own. How else could he arrange the 19,000 pictures of Turner for the National Gallery? He had championed not only Turner but also the Pre-Raphaelites and the Naturalistic Landscapists. He made known to the public the beauties of Early Christian Art, of Tintoret and Titian. He had created 'a department of literature all his own.' He had given to the public books containing passages of magnificent description couched in a style of great beauty and power. He had linked up the knowledge of the enlightned citizen about the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, with their architectural remains in Europe. But suddenly, in the midst of all this splendour, he heard the forlorn voice of the workman. The Enchanted Castle of Art vanished into thin air at this impact from the world of reality. Ruskin heard the call, sounded the clarion and entered into battle.

(c) 1860—70. The Hermit, Economist and Reformer.

The period which begins with the publication of *Unto This Last* in 1860 and ends with his appointment as the Slade Professor of Fine Arts in the University of Oxford in 1870, was an important one in Ruskin's life. It was marked by his ever-growing conviction that 'no real art was possible until there was a general improvement in the condition of the common people.' It was this conviction that made him pursue the study of economic and social problems. He retired into the solitude of the Alps to grapple with them and the outcome of these meditations was *Unto This Last*. He contributed the four papers which were "painfully thought out and carefully set down in his room at the Hotel de L'Union" to the *Cornhill Magazine*. The essays were extremely unpopular. The *Saturday Review* described them as 'Eruptions of windy hysterics' and as 'absolute nonsense.' But Carlyle was, as usual, enthusiastic about them. 'I marvel in part', he wrote, 'at the lynx-eyed sharpness of your logic, at the pincer-grip (red-hot pincers)

you dispose, stand to that kind of work for the next seven years, and work out then a result like what you have done in painting........." When, in 1862, Ruskin re-visited the Alps on his annual tour, he resumed his economic writings, which were published under the title *Munera Pulveris* nearly ten years later. These essays also raised a storm of criticism and Ruskin had to discontinue them. He now turned for a time to art and geology and to extensive travelling. He lost his father in 1864. The father left him a large fortune and a fine property at Denmark Hill. Ruskin now threw himself into an active life of 'public lectures, letters and controversy'. He addressed several audiences on widely divergent topics,—the art of reading, the foundation of libraries, the education of English women, the duties of soldiers, crystals and architecture. The choice of subjects is itself signi' cant for it shows the conflict that was going on in his mind etween his predilections as an artist and his preoccupation as social reformer.

The Sesame and ilies, his most popular work in a sense, was published in June, 1865. *The Crown of Wild Olive*, 1866, was also immediately popular. *The Ethics of the Dust*, 1866, contained a course of elementary lectures delivered to an audience of school girls on crystallography. Ruskin also read a paper on *The Study of Architecture in Schools* to the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1865. He contributed nine papers on the laws of art to the *Art Journal*. There was a general movement for parliamentary reform in 1867. The English working classes were particularly interested in this movement. Ruskin addressed a series of 25 letters entitled *Time and Tide* to Thomas Dixon, a Sunderland workman. He delivered his lecture on '*The Mystery of Life and Its Arts*' at Dublin in May, 1868. Ruskin himself remarked afterwards that it contained some of the best things he had to say to the people. He then visited Abbeville on whose architecture he delivered a lecture called "*The Flamboyant Architecture of the Valley of the Somne*," in January 1869. His interest in Greek Mythology was also revived about this time and in March he delivered two lectures at the University College of London on the Myths of Athena, called *The Queen of the Air*.

The letters and lectures referred to above contain some of

the best thoughts of Ruskin. Art is the theme of many of these lectures, but it has now been made definitely subservient to ethics. During all these ten years under review, Ruskin was no longer 'a mere art-critic.' He was the hermit and heretic calling in vain to the people to come out of 'Vanity Fair', and to learn the rudiments of the art of life. Ruskin was himself perplexed and bewildered in matters of faith.

He was appointed to the Slade Professorship of Art at Oxford in 1870. 'It is to his Oxford cycle of lectures that we must look for that matured Ruskinian theory of art which his earlier works do not touch.'

(*d*) 1870—1900. *Professor and Prophet.*

Ruskin's connection with Oxford continued until 1884 with a short break in 1877. His 'art-work brought him a good income.' He bought Brantwood, a house in the Lake District on the shore of Coniston Lake in 1871 and settled down there for the rest of his life. During several years of his professorship, he wrote monthly letters for the workmen of England, entitled '*Fors Clavigera*.' They contain his views on a variety of subjects, the main theme being 'a communism of wealth and joy.' "In these letters," says Benson, "he preached a communism of wealth and joy, and took up his parable against luxury and selfishness, idle accumulation and tyrannical oppression. The tide of eloquence goes rolling on, like a fiery flow of lava, full of endless digressions into autobiography and art, into poetry and legend and romance."

He also wished to translate his economic views into action and for that purpose established his "Guild of St. George," 1877 —"a sort of voluntary association, making agriculture its chief occupation, keeping at arm's length the spirit of commercialism, the root of all social evil, and devoting its hours of leisure to the cultivation of art and literature". 'Its objects, says Collingwood, 'were to set the example of a common capital as opposed to a National Debt, and co-operative labour as opposed to competitive labour for life. Each member was required to do some work for his living and to practise certain precepts of religion and morality, broad enough for general acceptance. He was also required to obey the authority of the Guild, and to contribute a tithe of his income to a

common fund for various objects. These were: (1) To buy land for the agricultural members to cultivate, paying their rent, not to other members, but to the company; not refusing machinery but preferring manual labour. (2) To buy mills and factories to be likewise worked by members, using water-power in preference to steam and making the lives of the people employed as well spent as might be, with a fair wage, healthy work and so forth. (3) Then for the people employed and their families, there would be places of recreation and instruction in Science, Literature and Art, supplied by the Guild.........So far the plan was simple. It was not a colony but merely the working of existing industries in a certain way (on a co-operative and socialistic basis) Anticipating further development of the scheme, Ruskin looked forward to a guild coinage as pretty as the Florentines had; a costume as becoming as the Swiss; and other platonically devised details which were not the essentials of the proposal and never came into operation. But some of his plans were actually realised." Ruskin sank a good part of his fortune in experimenting with the three-fold object of the Guild, —the attempt at an agricultural, industrial and educational re-organisation of life.

The early years of his professorship at Oxford were often weighed down with illness. But in spite of this he "lectured, founded a museum of art, to which he gave pictures and drawings and £5000. He sought to form at Oxford a school of drawing. He started a model shop for the sale of tea and model lodgings in Marylebone for poor tenants. At Oxford he set his pupils to work on making roads to improve the country." The shop for the sale of tea at Paddington was opened in order to sell tea 'as cheaply in small quantities to the small customers as if they had been able to buy a large amount at one time.' But it was successful only in a small measure, because people preferred the kind of shop they were used to.' Ruskin was laughed at for these ventures and for the faulty results that followed, when he set some Oxford undergraduates to 'mend a road near the city.' But Ruskin was not to be deterred from practising his own theories. Thus he started home-spun woollen industry and 'the village library, the linen and metal industries at Keswick, the Langdale hand-weaving,

are all mementoes of his pioneer work.' He was ridiculed for objecting to the establishment of railways and for travelling in a coach from Brantwood to London. He never objected to main lines of railway communication ; but he strongly objected in common with a vast number of people, to the introduction of railways into districts whose chief interest is in their scenery.'

Ruskin founded a museum in Sheffield and endowed it with his own library and art treasures. He also began to issue, in his characteristic manner, a complete edition of his works. Nor did he discontinue his visits to Switzerland and to Italy because of these preoccupations. His mother lived on to the age of ninety.

From 1880 onwards, Ruskin was repeatedly subjected to a 'painful nervous excitement of the brain which rendered him incapable of work for months together.' Yet he wrote in his lucid intervals a fascinating autobiography, *Praeterita*, a work which Harrison calls 'the most charming thing that he ever gave to the world, and one of the most pathetic and exquisite *confessions* in the language.'

Ruskin lived the last years of his life in almost complete retirement till his death in January 1900.

(2) The Genesis of The Crown of Wild Olive.

(a) *The transition from art to political economy and social reform.*

The transition from art to political economy and social reform was not an artificial or fantastic step taken by Ruskin. It was a part of the steady and spontaneous evolution of his personality. Ruskin himself explains the unity of his teaching in a letter, LXXVIII, *Fors Clavigera*. Vol. IV "At twenty I wrote *Modern Painters* ; at thirty, *The Stones of Venice* : at forty, *Unto this Last* : at fifty, the inaugural *Oxford Lectures* ; and at sixty, the *Fors*.........*Modern Painters* taught the claim of all lower nature on the hearts of men ; of the rock, and wave, and herb, as a part of his necessary spirit-life. The *Stones of Venice* taught the laws of Constructive Art, and the dependence of all human work or edifice, for its beauty, on the happy life of the workman ; *Unto this Last* taught the laws of

that life itself, and its dependence on the Sun of Justice; the inaugural *Oxford Lectures*, the necessity that it should be led, and the gracious laws of beauty and labour recognised, by the upper, no less than the lower class of England; and lastly, *Fors Clavigera* has declared the relation of these to each other."

The great thing that Ruskin did was to democratise both Art and Wealth. The common people were thought to be incapable of appreciating Art; just as Wealth was supposed to be for the privileged classes only and the poor were condemned to a life of mechanical labour. Ruskin brought Art into direct relation with the life of the common people, just as he showed that Wealth—properly defined—was meant for all people. Laurence Binyon sums up the position thus: "Whether his subject was rocks and plants, or painting and architecture, or housing and wages, or religion and ethics, he was driving all one way. What he had to say about Political Economy was the same as what he had to say about Art: the one was implied in the other. He was something more than a critical economist; he was an inspired interpreter of life and the beauty of life, he was a vindicator of human needs and human joy."

Mr. E. T. Cook, the biographer of Ruskin, holds the same views on the subject: "His diversion to economic enquiries was not so much a change as a development. His aesthetic criticism had from the first been coloured throughout by moral considerations. His study of architecture had convinced him that art is the expression of national life and character. He who would raise the flower must cultivate the proper soil."

'It is the vainest of affectations', Ruskin himself wrote afterwards, 'to try and put beauty into shadows, while all real things are in deformity and pain.' He wanted a thing of beauty not only to be a joy for ever but a joy for all. He realised clearly that the love of the Beautiful could flourish only under a better social order. The ugliness of industrial England, the Philistinism of the rich and the injustice done to the poor 'wronged' the image in his heart:—

> "The cry of a child by the roadway, the creak of a
> lumbering cart
> Are wronging the image that blossoms,—a rose in
> the deeps of my heart."

The passion for social justice in Ruskin was, therefore, the natural result of his attitude towards art and life. Art was to be valued only as contributing to the richness of life. Many of the early utterances of Ruskin make this view of his abundantly clear. "In these books of mine," he wrote in the fifth volume of *Modern Painters*. "their distinctive character as essays on art, is their bringing everything to a root in human passion or human hope......Every principle of painting which I have stated is traced to some vital or spiritual fact; and in my works on architecture, the preference accorded finally to one school over another, is founded on a comparison of their influences on the life of the workman." The very titles of the chapters in the *Seven Lamps of Architecture* bear witness to his ethical fervour and to his faith in the practical utility that the cultivation of art has for society. (The Lamps of Sacrifice, Truth, Power, Beauty, Life, Memory and Obedience.) He even defined beauty as 'the concrete final expression of rightness.' His definition of Architecture is equally characteristic. It is 'the art which so disposes and adorns the edifices raised by man, for whatsoever uses, that the sight of them may contribute to his mental health, power and pleasure.' The main text of the *Stones of Venice* is not 'simply the supremacy of Gothic art, but the wider one that art, and architecture in particular, is the most sensitive index of the moral goodness of a people.'

Thus although it is the art-critic that 'occupies the stage in the first twenty years of Ruskin's literary life, the social reformer was latent in him from the very beginning. His views on social matters were clear enough, even as far back as 1819, in the famous passage on machinery in the Lamp of Beauty in the *Seven Lamps*. 'He never deserted, as has been said, art for sociolgy. He took up sociology because of his love of art.' His social teaching was only a 'corollary' of his art-criticism that the "Ideas of Truth are the foundation, the Ideas of Imitation the destruction, of all Art." Art is only the outward manifestation of the inward beauty that haunts the imagination of every great artist. How could Art discharge her angelic duties if the modern world enthroned Steel and Iron and anointed them with petrol?

'Art', says Ruskin in *The Stones of Venice* 'is the expression

of one soul talking to another and is precious according to the greatness of the soul that utters it'. This very attitude towards art meant a drift towards socialism, for he took art out of the 'region of luxuries into the region of necessities and estimated its value, not by the pleasure it bestows on the possessor, but the good or the reverse of good it works on its unrecognised producer.' In the chapter on the *Nature of Gothic* in *The Stones of Venice*, Ruskin preached the doctrine of the liberty of the workman, which had 'indirect effects far and wide in places which are not devoted to debate architectural types.' It was to the degradation of the operative into the machine and to his being compelled by the rich to spend his energies in tasks which refuse to recognise the dignities of human beings that Ruskin directly traced both the modern hatred of the poor for the rich and the struggle for freedom, which was then being carried on all over Europe. When the right meaning of freedom is understood, it will be realised that to obey another man and to labour for him is not slavery. "But to feel the soul withering in them, unthanked,—this Nature bade not." Ruskin suggested the observance of three laws for avoiding the degradation of the workman: (1) The manufacture of any article, not absolutely necessary, in the production of which Invention has no share, should not be encouraged. (2) Never demand an exact finish for its own sake, but only for some practical or noble end. (3) Never encourage imitation or copying of any kind except for the sake of preserving the record of great works. The workman ought often to be thinking, and the thinker working, and both should be gentlemen. The distinction should be only in the experience and skill and the authority and wealth that these may obtain justly and honestly.

The significance of this transition from art to economics and sociology has been excellently brought out in the following passage:—

"Mr. Ruskin came at the psychological moment, when science had reduced all life to physical elements and industry, all men to machines, to correct this tendency by showing the other side of truth. Science teaches us that the stars stink, Art that they twinkle; Science that the clouds are a sleety mist," Art that they are "a golden throne." For Science is of essences, Art of aspects. The one, be it observed, is as much

a study of facts as the other. It is as much a fact to be noted in the constitution of things that they produce such and such an effect upon the eye or heart, as that they are made up of certain atoms of matter. And similarily with the conditions of modern industry as with the connection of modern science.........Art, to be really fine, must, as we have seen, be the representation of beautiful realities, and be pursued in a spirit of delight. And *where such conditions are not present, the teacher of Art is necessarily also a social reformer.* It is not that he wants to be; he simply cannot help it'.

"Mr. Ruskin's Political Economy—alternately adopted and abused—follows immediately and vitally from his Art teaching. The point of connection will come out most clearly if we consider the National Ideal, which is logically deducible from the orthodox Political Economy and the tendencies of modern commerce. This *Political economy taught* (or what is the same thing, was believed to teach) *that the road to national prosperity lies in the unchecked and competitive pursuit of material wealth* ; and the commercial tendencies of the time made England become more and more every day the workshop of the world, until (as Mr. Ruskin puts it) we shall soon arrive at "the state of the squirrel in a cage or a turnspit in a wheel, fed by foreign masters with nuts and dog's meat." Now, it is obvious that a National Ideal such as this is absolutely and entirely incompatible with any National Art such as Mr. Ruskin understands. It is incompatible both in temper and external conditions. Hence Mr. Ruskin was driven to the statement both of a new basis for Political Economy and a new definition of wealth. And just as his theory of art led him up to the problem, so also did it give him the clue to its solution. *The greatest work in Art, he found, had always been done, not in competition, but in co-operation,* not to sell, but to keep. The application of this idea to economics is the secret of his system. The well-being of individuals and nations alike consists, according to him, not in the multitude of things they possess, but in their virtues and joys. "*The wealth of any country,*" he laid down, "*is the portion of its possessions which feeds and educates good men and good women.*" The strength and power of a country depend on the quantity of good men and women in it." (E. T. Cook)

(*b*) *Ruskin's political economy as part of his general philosophy of life.*

Carlyle inspired the later work of Ruskin, just as Turner inspired his art-criticism. The great change came over Ruskin's life when he was forty. "Until he was forty," says Collingwood, "Mr. Ruskin was a writer on art; after that his art was secondary to his ethics. Until he was forty, he was a believer in English protestantism; afterwards he could not reconcile current beliefs with the facts of life as he saw them and had to reconstruct his creed from the foundations.........He began to see that no tinkering at social breakages was really worth while; that far more extensive repairs were needed to make the old ship sea-worthy......Something of a cloud had been settling over him—a sense of the evil of the world, a horror of great darkness......It was no wonder that Ruskin became like one of the hermits of old, who retreated from the world to return upon it with stormy messages of awakening and flashes of truth more impressive, more illuminating than the logic of schoolmen and the state-craft of the wise......And then he began to take up an attitude of antagonism to the world......Its respectabilities, its orthodoxies he could no longer abide. Orthodox religion, orthodox morals and politics, orthodox art and science alike, he rejected; and was rejected by each of them as a brawler, a babbler, a fanatic, a heretic."

The term 'Economy' stands for 'House law' or the system or management of the house. 'Political Economy' would then mean the right management of the affairs of a community. The word 'political', however, has changed its connotation slightly today. Hence what Ruskin called 'Political Economy' is known today as Economics. "It is a science,' says Miss Cunnington, "because it is a body of knowledge based upon certain principles or laws. It is not, however, one of the exact sciences like mathemetics, or even like chemistry, because there always enter into its considerations the 'inconstant' elements of human desires, feelings and motives. In academic classification it ranks as a moral science, belonging to a group distinct from the natural sciences; and is a part of moral philosophy or ethics. Ethics is concerned with conduct...and economics belongs to that part of the study of human actions in society, that is, in the ordinary business of life, getting a living."

But this was not the view of economics that prevailed when Ruskin came to write on the subject. The orthodox or 'classical' economists of the 'Manchester School'—Mill, Ricardo, Fawcett—emphasised 'Money' as the object of man's activities and believed in unrestricted competition. Their doctrine was one of *laissez faire* or 'leaving alone.' They held that the labourers and the capitalists should be left to themselves to settle the issues between them. They did not realise that unhealthy competition among the labourers for work would lead to starvation wages. They thought that the duties of the State were only to maintain order, administer law and to protect the people from foreign aggression. The idea that the State was entirely responsible for the physical, economic, social and cultural welfare of the people had not found acceptance among them.

Adam Smith has partly explained in his *The Wealth of Nations*, 1785, the conditions that brought about the Industrial Revolution and encouraged the acceptance of the doctrine of *laissez faire* by orthodox economists. It was during the period 1760-85 that 'the foundations of the modern system of industry' were laid. It was then that the improved means of transport by land and water came to exist. Watt showed how to utilise steam as motive-power. Improvements were made in mining and iron-smelting. New markets were opened up in the East and in the New World and the expansion of British trade kept pace with the growth of British imperialism. India became the major dumping-ground for British goods. Industrial cities sprang up everywhere in England, Bradford, Birmingham, Sheffield, Manchester and the Five Towns in the Pottery District. These were connected with the growth and development of major industries like the manufacture of hardware objects, of pottery and glass, and cotton-spinning. All these developments increased the wealth of the country. It therefore seemed to Adam Smith and the economists that followed him that self-interest was a powerful factor in keeping 'men's energy and intelligence' well employed. If this motive were allowed to work unchecked, the result would be an unrestricted competition between man and man for money. But the competition also was thought to be a regulating rather than a harmful influence.

Professor Hobson points out how economics became, in the hands of these thinkers, "the bondslave of the rising manufacturing and trading classes, who needed it to work their intellectual mill, just as they needed an abundant supply of cheap labour to work their textile and flour mills. The object of Political Economy, moulded under the pressure of these interests, was to build up a theory to support the current capitalist control of industry with its demand for increased quantity of output, expanding markets and abounding profits. Minute divisions of labour, unfettered competition, complete liberty of contract, such were the chief conditions for the maximum production of wealth towards which, as its final end, the formulas and methods of economic science were directed. This quantitative conception of the wealth of nations, and the monetary measure applied to estimate it, were the core of the indictment to which Ruskin devoted a large part of his intellectual and moral energy."

Ruskin was nót alone in challenging this injustice done to the poor. Dickens pictured the heart-rending conditions of the poor and the anomalies of Victorian England in his novels. Kingsley and E. D. Maurice spoke and wrote with indignation against the existing order of iniquity. Hood protested against it in powerful verse Carlyle, Ruskin's master, had attacked the doctrine of *laissez faire* in *Past and Present*. Ruskin joined them only too willingly. He attacked the economists who spoke of 'Economic man' as if he were quite different from the ordinary man and he insisted on the essential unity of man. The Industrial Revolution had, by this time, annihilated all village industries, replaced home-work by factory-work and man by the machine. The industrial towns were adding to their intolerably ugly streets and 'slums' and the lot of the industrial worker was appalling. Ruskin contended that neither the Revolution nor its theorists were justified if they succeeded only in making the majority of the people miserable. "He sought," says Mr. Cook, "to overthrow the basis of the doctrines accepted in his time; to outline a scheme of social economy, which should take its place ; and to show how his principles would work out in laws, customs and institutions. His three books—*Unto This Last*, *Munera Pulveris*, and *Time and Tide*—cover to some extent the same ground and often overlap; yet looked at broadly,

tney may be said to correspond to the three-fold division just stated."

Ruskin was the apostle of medievalism in Victorian England. The Middle Ages were, to him, not the 'dark but the bright' ages. 'He repudiated modern science, modern machinery, modern politics,—in short, modern civilization.' It was his medievalism that made him advocate the Gothic style in architecture, underrate Greek art and admire Pre-Raphaelitism. It also coloured 'the ecclectic catholicism' into which he finally drifted as a religious thinker. He also disclaimed the theory of art for art's sake. He held that all art was for God's sake,—all art is Praise. It was also his medievalism that made him inculcate the doctrine of authority and obedience and adopt 'a kind of aristocratic socialism as his economic creed.' Many of the thinkers and artists of the time—Newman, Ruskin, Burne-Jones and the Pre-Raphaelites—were all dissatisfied with their environment. All of them sought for inspiration in the history and life of the Middle Ages. Ruskin did for art and political economy what Newman did for religion. He stressed the aesthetic values of life, if the Oxford Movement gave paramountcy to moral values. He pleaded for a revival of Gothic architecture because 'he found in it all the principles he loved—naturalism, morality, religion, individual beauty and the liberty of the workman'. The prominence he gave to medievalism in his theory of art and political economy was only the beginning. He had the same ideal of life in view when he started St. George's Guild in 1877.

He, therefore, attacks, with great force, the bastard science of 'mercantile economy'. 'It is,' he said, 'with no fortuitous choice among the attributes or powers of evil that 'Mammon' is assigned for the direct adversary of the Master whom they are bound to serve. You cannot, by any artifice of reconciliation, be God's soldier, and his. Nor while the desire of gain is within your heart, can any true knowledge of the kingdom of God come there. No one shall enter its strong-hold—no one receive its blessing, except "he that hath clean hands and a pure heart"; clean hands that have done no cruel deed,—pure heart that knows no base desire. And, therefore, in the highest spiritual sense that can be given to words, be assured, not respecting the literal temple of stone and gold but of the

living temple of your body and soul, that no redemption, nor teaching, nor hallowing, will be anywise possible for it, until these two verses have been, for it also, fulfilled :—' And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought." 'And He taught daily in the temple."

(c) ***Ruskin as Prophet.***

We have seen already that two of the influences that moulded Ruskin's outlook on life, about the time that he delivered the lectures contained in *The Crown of Wild Olive*, were his apprehension of the spiritual value of art, both for the artist and the public, and his faith in the 'democratisation' of wealth which could be secured only by realising the incalculable harm, that a pursuit of money for its own sake resulted in. We should now be prepared to regard Ruskin not merely as an art-critic and a political economist but as a prophet. He attacked the besetting sins of Victorian England wherever they were found. He was not merely concerned with the democratisation of art and wealth. He was the apostle of Life and he worked for the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. Art, architecture, wealth, education, war, science, religion,—all these and many other subjects attracted him, because he was interested in an all-sided regeneration of humanity. Ruskin has been ridiculed for tinkering with subjects not his own. He has been regarded as a great art-critic spoilt by his incursions into political economy. People failed to see 'what an authority on Botticelli had to say on wages.' But his life was all of a piece. It is, of course, true that he never sought to reconcile inconsistencies in his own thought and attitude. At times he could be correctly described as 'a modern St. Francis with a strong dash of Cromwell and a milder dash of Don Quixote in his composition'. But we must also recognise the indisputable genius of the man. It lay, as has been said, "far less in any *one* of the roles he assumed during his long life than in the superb suggestiveness that he brought to bear on a host of subjects apparently disconnected ... .He was neither pre-eminently a deep thinker nor a man of supreme excellence in any one department of literature, but a man of high moral principle, of splendid though ill-co ordinated intellectual power, of luxuriant imagination, all of which qualities he turned on to a rich variety of subject-matter".

Ruskin himself admitted as much. He said that many men had 'hope of being remembered as the discoverers of some important truth, or the founders of some exclusive system called after their own names.' But 'I have never applied myself to discover anything, being content to praise what had already been discovered; so that no true disciple of mine will ever be a Ruskinian.' But Ruskin was also conscious of the fact that he was a prophet with a message to be delivered to his country. After giving a 'whimsical summary' of his life-work in the passage quoted in one of the preceding pages from *Fors Clavigera*, he added: "This, then, is the message, which, knowing no more as I unfolded the scroll of it, what next would be written there, than a blade of grass knows what the form of its fruit shall be, I have been led on year by year to speak, even to this its end."

Benson pays admirable tribute to Ruskin's work as art-critic, writer and reformer. "As an *art-critic* he certainly established a new tradition......He made art serious and he made it respected; and here his teaching may yet bear fruit, though it was disfigured by his ethical bias, which confused the truth of things by trying to refer two perfectly separate impulses—the moral and the artistic—to one basis......And then as a *writer* he can hardly be said to have established a tradition, because his art depended upon so intimate and personal a charm. I am thankful myself that he did not establish a tradition in this respect—for while such a tradition is a great sign of commanding influence in a writer, it is a sign of a corresponding weakness in his followers"......Benson also gives an estimate of Ruskin's work as a *reformer*. "He did see into the weakness of commercialism, and he grasped the fact that the only real socialism must be based on individualism. He saw that the mechanical theory of labour and of trade competition was essentially degrading, because it did not evoke the gifts of the individual, and rewarded shrewdness rather than industry. And here he threw his whole weight into the right scale. His grasp of economical details was unsound, but his insight into true,

that of either art-critic, writer or reformer. He was a prophet. What is it that makes a prophet? The Late Prof. E. A. Wodehouse used to give an illuminating exposition of the role and function of a prophet to his pupils in Deccan College, Poona. Here is an abstract of his views. A reading of it will convince the reader that any further attempt at an analysis of the subiect is superfluous for our purpose.

The prophet is a man who upholds one clear-cut doctrine against another just as clearly cut. He is thus usually to be found in the early stages of some conflict between two great philosophies of life, while the opposing issues are still clear, before they have been complicated by being compromised.

This applies to the three Victorian writers in their reaction against the inroads of the industrial spirit:—Carlyle, Arnold and Ruskin. Carlyle opposed its sham and ill-done work and its threat to social order and stability. His remedy was—*discipline*. Arnold fought against its ignorance and vulgarity and his remedy was culture. Ruskin inveighed against its enslavement of the worker, its killing out of some of the beauty of life and its lack of any real moral ideal. His remedy was religion.

In all these cases the conflict was clear. There was no doubt as to what the three sides stood for. They put the three writers into that definite relation to their age, which makes them prophets.

Nowadays the issues have become complex and obscure, because industrialism has been accepted as a necessity of the age and we have therefore to find a place for it in our philosophy of life. The task now is not simply to oppose it—for that would be like trying to keep back the waters of the sea—but to find some compromise, which while giving it a place in our social system, will, at the same time, seek to minimise its worst evils. We have to re-interpret moral and social philosophy in such a way as to accept industrialism but also to set up counteracting forces to keep its abuses in check—possibly even to make good come out of evil. Hence the vast number and intricacy of the schools of social thought in our times. Hence, by a logical consequence, the absence of the 'prophets' of the age, in the sense in which the word can be applied to Ruskin, Arnold and Carlyle.

Benson sums up Ruskin's position as a prophet thus: "As a prophet, he was unbalanced and unconvincing, because he had depth rather than width of view. He did not see the whole problem. He saw clearly enough into the hearts of like-minded people, but he was essentially a partisan, and condemned what he did not understand as severely as he condemned what he hated. He took, from his education and his sheltered life, a meagre view of the world......He did not even do justice to his age; he overlooked one of the best and strongest forces of his time—the resolute search of truth, the stern determination of the scientific spirit not to generalise till it has investigated. He went wrong himself in every department of his work, from his passion for generalisation and his acquiescence in incomplete investigation ...He had no notion of just comparison, and when his sympathy was not enlisted, he could not even analyse. He had the power of putting vague personal preferences into language superficially exact, and this was a terrible snare to his followers, who believed that they were getting logical reasons, when they were only getting instinctive predilections. Yet I am far from saying that as a prophet his work was thrown away. He was no ascetic, as I have said, and thus he was able to see the dangers of the materialism that is not uplifted by the concurrence of the soul. But he felt that the invariable comfort in which he lived to some extent invalidated his message. "If I had lived in a garret," he once wrote, "then I could have preached that Queen Victoria should do the same"........He accepted the precise standard of material luxury in which he had been himself brought up, and he regarded any extension or development of this as base and degrading. Yet he was here in the main right, because he saw that the bane of the age is its impatience of simplicity, its worship of success, its preference of comfort, and its mistaking the quality of pleasure."

A good part of this extract is concerned with Ruskin's shortcomings as a prophet. In fr t, Benson is inclined to think that the interest of Ruskin's life is the "interest of a personality... and not either as a prophet, or a reformer, or an art-critic, or a writer. He was all these things by turns—they were but the guises which this restless and ardent temperament assumed." But one may as well ask the question as to what a

prophet without a personality is. Ruskin had these shortcomings as a prophet. Further, his vision of the world is one of 'instinctive sadness' and it 'deepens and feeds' the sadness of the reader. But we must also remember that Ruskin was often listened to with profound respect and that he was able to influence contemporary thought in several spheres in a remarkable manner. Lectures such as those collected in *The Crown of Wild Olive* could never have been delivered if they had not been received with respect. Why was he held in such great esteem even when his views were not always accepted by his hearers? The reason is that the genuineness of his personality captivated his audiences. His charm and moral force enabled him to do whatever he did. Again, Benson thinks that Ruskin was "like all the greatest figures of our late nineteenth century—Tennyson, Browning, Carlyle,—a moralist before anything else." But all prophets are that and Ruskin was a major prophet and a restless and indefatigable one because of his moral fervour. We cannot, therefore, regard him simply as 'a personality and a moralist' and ignore his work as a prophet, though we admit that his positive virtues as a prophet were his charm and moral force. In fact, Benson himself admits in a passage that Ruskin had one or two distinguishing marks of the true prophet. "But Ruskin, and such as Ruskin......are so sensitive to all injustice and to all brutality, that they lose themselves in scathing words, and feverish phrases of horror and disgust and despair. And then when the schemes that seem to such prophets so simple and so desirable, so effective in helping humanity out of the mire, all break down and incur ridicule and contempt, what wonder if they fall into wretchedness and frenzy at the thought of all the happiness which men throw away from themselves......It was here, I think, that the strength of Ruskin's message lay. Men who see and feel as he did are the hope of the human race, because they show that the moral temperature is slowly but surely rising, and that the generous and noble impulses of the conscience and the heart are on the increase. And Ruskin had to my mind one distinguishing mark of the true prophet—that he was no patriot. He was concerned

moralist before anything else. Finally, he tells us that it a 'personality and as a moralist' that we have to regard him. But he also includes moral force as a 'further' quality of Ruskin's personality. Considering all this we may say that Ruskin was a prophet gifted with a powerful personality and that its two distinguishing qualities were charm and moral force. Benson has given an admirable description of these two qualities: "A personality is more than a mere mixture or blend of ingredients. But when it comes to the deeper relations of life, when one is concerned with loving and admiring people, being moved by what they say or think, imitating, even worshipping them, there come in two further qualities, which are not only a question of blend and proportion, but two perfectly distinct things, two qualities which are difficult to disentangle and analyse, because they permeate other qualities, making them on the one hand attractive and on the other emphatic. And these two qualities are on the one hand charm and on the other moral force. It is very difficult to say what charm is, and in what it consists. It is a thing which some people possess to an extraordinary degree, making all that they do or say interesting and beautiful, penetrating gesture and movement, feature and voice, so that it all seems a revelation of some secret and inner beauty of soul and mind..... And then there is a further kind of charm, which is not a superficial charm, but the fragrance of a sweet-tempered, simple, and peaceable character, which wins regard and trust because it is modest and trust-worthy, reasonable and sympathetic, and does not easily condemn or despise.

"Now Ruskin had both of these kinds of charm. He was, in ordinary companionship, extraordinarily graceful and winning, courteous and considerate............And Ruskin, in his public lectures, had an incomparable atmosphere of grace and pathos about him. His high, clear, and delicate voice rose like the voice of the wind; his vehement and brilliant gestures amplified and interpreted his words; and his flashing eyes with their pale blue light, now indignant and now appealing, intercepted and electrified the glances of his hearers. There was little of the art of the orator about him—little of that voluminous thunder which in men like Mr. Bright and Mr. Gladstone dominated an audience and kept them spell-bound, waiting on

every measured word. Compared to these the eloquence of Ruskin had an almost feminine quality; it was the music of the soul that made itself heard whether in the passionate enthusiasm for some work of delicate grace or suggestive beauty, or the poignant personal distress, the uncomforted cry for faith and strength, which came with an appealing frankness from his lips............

"And then of that other quality, which I have called moral force, which is like the steam of the engine or the charge of the gun—that force of conviction which drives a truth home into careless or different minds—this he had in fullest measure......

"It is then as............that we have to regard him, as a man of clear vision, relentless idealism, and kindling speech; who above all manifested the splendid instinctive abnegation of private happiness, not calculating loss and gain in a spirit of barter, but finding contentment impossible, while others were ill content; the spirit which is expressed by a parable in the beautiful words of the Song of Songs: 'They made me the keeper of the vineyards; but mine own vineyards have I not kept.'

(*d*) *The condition in Victorian England and in Europe that roused the fury of the prophet in Ruskin*:

The Industrial Revolution had resulted in the multiplication of ugly, industrial towns all over England. The loveliness of the countryside was being continually desecrated by the inroads of the industrial spirit. There was an expansion of trade and a consequent inflow of wealth,—but it was all in the hands of the rich. The Reform Bill of 1832 had made the middle classes powerful by taking away power from the aristocracy. But the prospects of the worker or the wage-earner remained as dark as ever. He was completely at the mercy of the wealthy tradesmen of the industrial towns, doing whatever work was allotted to him for any wages that were given him. Unrestricted competition between worker and worker made the capitalist the sole master of the situation. Even the Reform Bill of 1867 gave the workers an enfranchisement the full benefits of which were not realised by them till many years later. The middle classes, on the other hand, had developed an inordinate sense of self-complacency and self-importance. They believed that all was well with the world because they had money in their purses. The expansion of

trade and the progress of mechanical invention made their life easy and comfortable and many of them rolled in luxury. So long as their grip on their own purses was tight, they could afford to speak vaguely of the Parliament of Man that would one day be made possible by the growth of commercial intercourse and of the Federation of the World that would put an end to all wars. They also spoke of the spread of education that would put an end to all crime and poverty. And yet, all the while, the poor workman, who was 'steaming up a tale of lamentation and of wrong', was unheeded.

Ruskin saw through the Philistinism and the callous indifference of the middle classes. He denounced the soullessness that was at the root of the prosperity of Victorian England. He resented the growth of ugly towns and the disappearance of lovely, rural scenery. Even in *The Stones of Venice* Ruskin had remarked that the function of architecture was to counterbalance our loss of fellowship with nature, as we were forced to live in cities. But was this function ever fulfilled in a London street "with its grim railings and dark casements, wasteful finery of shops and feeble coxcombry of club-houses?" And so Ruskin had declared that 'the fresh wind and sunshine of the upland are better than the choke-damp of the vault, or the gaslight of the full room.'

Nor were the mechanical inventions of the century beneficial to the workers The vast majority of the people in England were turned into tools, manufacturing 'the finished ornaments and unerring adjustments of seasoned wood and tempered steel in your English room',—signs of a slavery in England more bitter than that of the scourged African, for it is the slavery of the *soul*. "The animation of her multitudes is sent like fuel to feed the factory smoke, and the strength of them is given daily to be wasted into the fineness of a web, or racked into the exactness of a line." (*Nature of Gothic*: *The Stones of Venice*).

Again, the Victorians had been 'puffed up' by knowledge. Nor could they see why knowledge should not achieve everything. Ruskin, therefore, condemned the Victorian system of education which forced knowledge on people without examining its intrinsic worth or worthlessness. He pointed out in *The Stones of Venice* that knowledge often kills the perceptive faculty, and that it is often unnecessary and sometimes untrust-

worthy. We should only acquire knowledge so far as it is necessary and subordinate it to our faculty of vision. The man of genius is a child in essence.

The Victorians were used to 'Churchianity' rather than to 'Christianity'—i.e. a genuine ordering of life according to the teachings of Christ. The Pecksniffs in society must go. What matters is not the ritualism of the church or the orthodoxy of religion. Metaphysical questions like the immortality of the soul need not affect our wise and courageous attitude towards life, whatever may be the solution to these questions. 'Fate may be bravely met and conduct wisely ordered on either expectation.' Ruskin also deals with this theme in the lecture delivered on the Mystery of Life in Dublin in 1869. "Because you have no heaven to look for, is that any reason that you should remain ignorant of this wonderful and infinite earth, which is firmly and instantly given you in possession? Although your days are numbered, and the following darkness sure, is it necessary that you should share the degradation of the brute, because you are condemned to its mortality; or live the life of the moth, and of the worm, because you are to companion them in the dust? Let us do the work of men while we bear the form of men; and, as we snatch our narrow portion of time out of Eternity, snatch also our narrow inheritance of passion out of Immortality—even though our lives *be* as a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." The recent developments in science, which culminated in Darwin's formulation of the theory of Evolution, had shaken men's beliefs. The first chapter of the old Testament of the Bible had been exploded as a myth. Tennyson, Clough and Arnold were some of the fine spirits of the time, that were perplexed by this conflict between science and religion,—the debate of the century. Science was fast undermining the faith of the people. But it did not provide them with any other form of faith as a tolerable substitude. The result was that the Victorians were drifting away from essential Christianity into an attitude of callous indifference and criminal insensitiveness to the finer sides of life. It was this wordliness of the people that Ruskin sought to attack in his lectures.

Lastly, wars continued to be waged as fiercely as ever, inspite of all vague talks about peace. There were wars being

waged in Europe. If England did not take part in them, it was not at all to her credit. Her aloofness was the result of her treachery. Then, again, there was civil war in America,—'the just terminated war in America' as Ruskin refers to it in his lecture on War. The race for armaments had already begun. Each country was using its skilled engineers and scientists for the manufacture of terrible weapons of war. How could such an atmosphere of 'belligerent peace' ever prove to be conducive to the fine arts of life? How could one be so sure of the blessings conferred on mankind by science, when science was devoting itself days and nights to the discovery of the various ways and means of destroying mankind effectively? Ruskin spoke unequivocally against the wickedness of the governments that made soldiers the 'servants of shopkeepers' and 'the police of England's manufacturing towns and the beadles of her little Bethels.'

The Crown of Wild Olive, therefore, has a two-fold origin. We have, on the one hand, the noble and the highly sensitive mind of Ruskin who started as an art-critic, developed into a political economist and social reformer and finally emerged as a prophet. On the other hand, there is the tragic spectacle of Victorian England, tragic because of her soulless rich and her helpless poor. It is when boundless self-complacency and unending misery exist side by side as parts of the same social order without reacting effectively on each other that the need for satirists and prophets arises. Such a need had arisen in Victorian England and Ruskin was the prophet of the hour.

3. The Title of the Book.

The address delivered to the working men at the Camberwell Institute, January 24th, 1865, on 'Work' was published together with two others in 1866 under the title of '*The Crown of Wild Olive*.' The second lecture—the one on 'Traffic'—was delivered at the Bradford Chamber of Commerce in April 1864. The subject of the third lecture was 'War'. It was delivered at the Royal Academy, Woolwich, in February, 1866. The book was republished in 1873, with a fourth lecture added,—the one on 'The Future of England' delivered at the Royal Artillery Institute, Woolwich, in 1870. A 'Preface and notes on the political growth of Prussia', from Carlyle's 'Frederick', were also added

to the 1873 edition. Ruskin wrote the preface to the first edition of the book and prepared it for publication in 1866.

Nothing is more characteristic of Ruskin than the titles which he gave to his books. At first sight they appear to be obscure or meaningless and almost fantastic. But they are always suggestive and they have a profound significance. Ruskin's titles have been described as "cryptograms" i. e., words with a hidden meaning. Another critic describes them as "portmanteau words." His titles are as closely packed with meaning as a symbolic painting or a myth. Consider the title: *Sesame and Lilies* given to the lectures on the influence of good books and of good women on mankind. The method of careful reading—word-to-word reading—which he expounds in the first lecture—"*Sesame: Of King's Treasuries,*" is to give to the reader the "Open Sesame" i. e., the clue or passport to the treasures that are contained in the best books. There are also minor suggestions of meaning which it is needless to explain here. Similarly the title of the second lecture—"*Lilies: of Queen's Gardens*" has been thus explained: "The territory over which a good woman exerts her sway is the Garden of a Queen; the Lily, emblem of purity, is the sceptre of her rule—type of the pure influence which she may wield both at home and in the world." "The path of a good woman is indeed strewn with flowers, but they rise behind her steps, not before them.' "Her feet have touched the meadows, and left the daisies rosy."

Let us now turn to the meaning of the title "*The Crown of Wild Olive.*" The olive tree had been associated with a deep symbolism in the mind of Ruskin. He was a careful student of botany, a minute examiner of all kinds of trees, plants, and grass, and he used to draw or engrave them. According to Ruskin every tree and plant, every bird and reptile was a myth with a meaning if only we could read it. In the second lecture, in the *Queen of the Air*, he has explained the significance of some of them. "Thus the olive plant has triple significance in this symbolism, from the use of its oil for sacred anointing, for strength in the gymnasium, and for light. Hence in numberless divided, reflected ways, it is connected with the power of Hercules and Athena. Hercules plants the wild olive, for its shade, on the course of Olympia, and it thenceforward gives the Olympic crown consummate honour and rest, while the prize

at the Panathenaic games is a vase of its oil (meaning encouragement to continuance of effort)". Ruskin next refers to the curious coincidence that it was under an olive tree that Christ suffered the Agony of Crucifixion and asks the readers to think if they can reach with any grasp of thought, what the influence on the earth has been, 'of those twisted branches whose leaves give gray bloom to the hillsides under every breeze that blows from the midland sea.' (§ 38 *Q. of A.*)

The Greeks celebrated four important national festivals when contests were held in athletic exercises, music, poetry, and drama. These contests attracted large crowds from distant parts of Greece and victory in these contests was regarded as the highest honour that could befall a Greek or the city to which he belonged. The reward for victory was the crown or wreath of some plant (in addition to a small monetary prize). In the Olympic Games, the victors's prize was a crown of wild olive; in the Pythian Games, a crown of laurel; in the Nemean Games, a crown of parsley; and in the Isthmian Games, a crown of the pine. Ruskin took the motto on the title page from a passage in the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, the one attributed to Poverty:

"But verily ye are both purblind with wild prejudices that blear the mind's eye; Zeus, of course, is poor and this I will now clearly show you. For if he were rich, how is it that when he himself institutes the Olympic Contest, in order that he may always bring together all the Greeks in each fifth year, he proclaimed that those of the athletes who won the prize should be wreathed with the Crown of Wild Olive? And indeed it should have been of gold, had not Zeus been so poor."

So then, the reward for which honest men strive is honour, not riches; the crown for which brave men have lived and died, and yet may nobly live, "mixed with grey leaf and thorncut stem," yet sweet for the victory by which it has been won,—type of grey honour and sweet rest."—"Ruskin calls his wreath of wild olive; "serviceable for the life which now is; nor, it may be, without promise of that which is to come."

Thus the choice of this title for the three lectures signifies that what men should strive for, in work and industry and in traffic and war, is not the 'yellow metal', not the gold that

glitters and perishes but the sweet 'consent' of one's own conscience, the highest good and the approval of God.

Ruskin's titles delight us by their charm, fancy and poetic quality. An eminent critic has told us that the very titles of Hazlitt's essays make us smack our lips. This could be said, with even greater propriety, of the titles of many of Ruskin's works:—*The Seven Lamps of Architecture, the Stones of Venice* (the title which inspired Carlyle to speak of *a sermon in stones*), *Unto this Last* (Biblical in origin), *Time and Tide by Weare and Tyne, The Eagle's Nest* and so forth. (The information in this section has been partly derived from Cook's biography of Ruskin, Vol. II. 96-97.)

4. Ruskin's views on Useless Work and on Religion.

(A Summary of the Introduction).

1. *The distinction between 'useful' work and 'useless' work is the very basis of Political Economy.*

Two examples are given,—one of useful work neglected, the other of useless work done.

"The waters of the springs of the Wandle twenty years ago were pure. But now they have been defiled and poisoned by the accumulation of all kinds of foul dirt. Half-a-dozen men, with one day's work, could cleanse those pools; but this useful work is not done.

On the other hand, there has been set up an ornamental iron-railing to enclose a small piece of ground in front of a new public-house in the back streets of Croydon. Now this iron-railing, uselessly enclosing the ground, represents a quantity of work which would have cleansed the Carshalton pools (the Wandle) three times over. Again, this work of mining, smelting and moulding—is from beginning to end, venomous, deathful, and miserable.

How is it that this kind of useless work is done, but the useful work of cleansing the Wandle neglected?

The reason is that the capitalist can charge percentage on the work in the one case, and cannot in the other. In cleansing the ground he can use his money only once (for paying the labourers); but in making the iron-railing he can use his money in three operations—digging out the iron, the manufac-

ture of the railing, and its sale,—and thus his percentage is greater. The capitalist only looks to the opportunites for charging this percentage, and not to the uselessness or otherwise of his products.

In our example, the Croydon publican did not make his shop more attractive than before by the iron-railing. The price of this railing he must either bear himself, or make his customers bear it by raising the price of beer or adulterating it. Thus, either he, or his customers, are the poorer by precisely what the capitalist has gained ; and the value of the industry itself, in the meantime, has been lost to the nation, the iron bars in that form and place being wholly useless.

Thus a modern capitalist is like the baron of olden times. Only, the latter came as an open robber, but the former comes as a cheating pedlar ; but both live upon the industry of the poor. Though it is true that there are many industries that are useful, and that useless industry may be better than idleness, we cannot call this 'political economy.'

It is laid down by these 'political economists' that, as all money has to be ultimately spent and has thus to return to the poor, the gathering of the property of the poor into the hands of the rich does no harm to the poor. Now the fallacy of robbery has been repeatedly exposed; but not the fallacy of the other kind of robbery which is equally bad, namely deceiving the poor by selling them useless things.

But this is the most fundamental question in 'political economy'—the kind of work to which the labourers are put. If the work is useful, *e. g.* producing food, fresh air &c., it does not matter if their wages are low ; the food, fresh air etc., will be there and the labourers will at last get them. But if the work is useless e. g. making of iron bars, then even their high wages are of no avail, for there will be no food, fresh air etc., to buy.

II. Religion: Ruskin complains that the public has never been able to appreciate the truth of his economical teachings, and he analyses the causes underlying their inability to do so.

The essence of his teaching has been that the wealth of nations, as of men, consists in substance, not in ciphers ; and that the real good of all work, and of all commerce, depends on

the final intrinsic worth of the things you make or get by it. As against this, 'Political Economy' says that 'business' is good irrespective of the nature of that business.

One reason why he has not been able to enforce his essential teachings upon his English audiences—whether operatives, merchants, or soldiers—has been that he could not know from them what they felt as to the ultimate meaning of the business they had in hand – of their manufactures, exchange, and war.

And this, in its turn, was due to the impossibility of knowing from them whether they believed in an Eternal Life, or did not believe in it.

But no dogmatic assertion with reference to the nature of war, traffic, or work is possible unless some reference is made to this intractable question of belief, or absence of belief, in a future life.

He was wont to appeal to the authority of the Bible, assuming that his audience had faith in that Book.

But if this assumption was unwarranted, and if his hearers had no faith in a future life, he could still show, under that supposition, that a wise man must make the utmost use of this life.

To have no faith in future life is not necessarily an ignoble judgment. It argues depravity in the Church, when it assumes that such a want of faith is either inconsistent with purity of character or energy of hand.

Those who believe in future life can afford to neglect the opportunities of this life. But no such hope, and therefore, no such excuse, is there for those who deny a future Life. They cannot afford to oppress the poor, or inflict sorrow upon them, or be unjust to them.

The same contrast between the two views can be put in another way. You may play, if you care to play, and waste this life, if you regard the earth only as a hospital and if you have faith in an after-life. But you cannot afford to neglect this life if you regard it as the most valuable, having no faith in a future existence.

You must prepare yourself for a strenuous struggle in this very life and the highest reward that you may expect for victory in this struggle, is not a crown of gold but a Crown of Wild Olive.

5. Ruskin's Views on Work and the Future of Working Men.

(A Summary of the first lecture.)

I. *The upper and the lower classes ; idleness and industry.*

There is an impropriety in speaking to the members of the Working Men's Institute upon the trifling subject of Art. Such institutes have great possibilities if only the teachers understand the object and method of educating and amusing the workmen.

As to the distinction between working men and idle men :— Can we call the latter the upper class and the former the lower class ? Are all employers or rich men idle ?

The fact is that there are the idle poor and the idle rich and the busy poor and the busy rich. The distinction between workers and idlers runs through all classes of men ; and class-hatred arises as the busy rich have no patience with the idle poor and the latter are intolerant of the wealth of the former.

Nothing will be said about the idle people. But even among the industrious, the distinctions are of great importance.

The rest of this lecture will be devoted to a consideration of these distinctions.

II. *These distinctions are mainly four :—*

(a) Between those who work, and those who play.

(b) Between those who produce the means of life, and those who consume them.

(c) Between those who work with the head, and those who work with the hand.

(d) Between those who work wisely, and those who work foolishly.

(*a*) *The distinction between Work and Play.*

"Play" is an exertion of body or mind, made to please our selves, and with no determined end ; and "work" is a thing done because it ought to be done, and with a determined end.

The first game of the playing classes in England is that of "making money". To have more money than what others have got, is their game.

But we must distinguish between "winning" money and "making" it.

Their next game is that of hunting and shooting. But this game is not only costly but, when not taken for exercise, it induces in them the habit of "gambling" ; and game-preserving leads to an ugly disfigurement of the country.

Then there is the ladies' game of dressing : but here the complaint is not that they dress themselves too nicely but that they neglect the poor.

But the play of plays is the game of War. The players of this game dress gorgeously and require costly equipment—all the cost of which is paid for by the deadly work of the poor. To the latter "play" means "to be laid by sickness". This is what the word means in the Brimingham dialect.

But this kind of play, sustained by the blood of others ,must be abolished.

(*b*) *The distinction between those who produce and those who consume i e. between the poor and the rich.*

The fact of poverty is illustrated by extracts from the *Morning Post* and the *Telegraph* about the death of a bone-picker and the poor dietary of paupers.

The distinction between the rich and the poor rests on a basis which is partly lawful and therefore necessary, and partly unlawful and therefore corrupting.

It is lawful so far as a man accumulates "the fair value of his labour" instead of spending it. The idle or the wasteful should be prevented from despoiling a man of "the just earnings of his labour".

It is unlawful so far as it represents the power held over those who are earning wealth by those who already possess it, and only see it to gain more.

The mere accumulation of wealth cannot be, like dinner, the object of life for a "well-educated or brave" man. It is a means to an end and not the end itself.

The primary object of a soldier is to fight well and not to get his pay ; that of a preacher is essentially to baptize and preach well and not so much to be paid for his preaching ; that of a doctor to cure the sick and not so much to get his fees.

Thus with all brave and rightly trained men work comes first, and fees second.

If Work comes first with you, you are God's servants; if Fees comes first with you,—you are the Fiend's servants.

The fiend's servants—the persons whose sole object is to make money—are as stupid as Judas, who betrayed Christ for the sake of money. They cannot understand Him. They make money by the force of money itself. This is the power of capital i. e. the power which money, once obtained, has over the labour of the poor, so that the capitalist can take all its produce to himself, except the labourer's food.

Money represents power over the labour of the poor. Just as in the Middle Ages, the barons, from their mountain-strongholds, levied toll upon the poor, similarly in modern times, the plutocrats make the poor pay toll to them. If the medieval baron is a crag-baron, the modern capitalist is a bag-baron, and the poor suffer equally from both. Bags and crags have just the same result on rags.

The great unfailing principle is this—whenever money is the principal object of life, it is both ill-got and ill-spent; whenever it is not the principal object, it will be well-got and well spent.

Money is not the principal object of a man's life, if, after earning it well and spending it well, he dies poor.

Money that is not spent must be either hoarded or lent—and the worst use of money is to lend it—for it is this money that supports and protracts all unjust wars.

What is the significance of all loans to foreign governments? You thereby enable them to keep down and tax their own peasants, out of the proceeds of whose labour your interest ultimately comes.

(c) *The distinction between those who work with the head, and those who work with the hand.*

Both kinds of work are equally necessary and the same men cannot do both. Rough men must do rough work; noble men must do noble work.

But it is no use denying the fact that rough work takes the life out of us, though it be real, honest and generally useful. On the other hand a great deal of "fine work" is foolish and false and dishonourable.

All hand-work is inherently toilsome and degrading. That is why the days of rest are called "holy" days and hence the

bright prospect held out to those who labour hard in this life and die in the Lord's assurance that "they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."

There are two questions to be asked with regard to rough work :

(*i*) *Who is to do it ? Or how is it to be distributed ?*

(*ii*) *How is the doer of it to be comforted, redeemed and rewarded ?*

(*i*) *As to the distribution of hand-work,* whoever has to do it must do it in an orderly, soldierly, human way—lawful or "loyal' way. 'But you set about doing the labour of destruction i. e. war in an ordered way, but not the labour of production e. g. agriculture.'

In fact you will not be able to do the right thing in this connection unless you learn "to do justice to each other."

That is the basis of all right action, and the burden of the teaching of the Bible—"Do justice and judgment," in which consists the "Service of God". But you call praying and psalm-singing "the Service of God" and even impudently announce that "Divine Service" i. e. chanting of hymns &c. will be 'performed.' Divine Service is really the doing of justice.

We cannot be charitable unless we are just ; for charity is the summit of the temple, of which justice is the foundation.

Charity really begins at home and is essentially love of one's self. You give nice and tidy clothes to your children because you love them. Charity goes abroad when you give a penny to the crossing sweeper.

But justice is not satisfied with the mere giving of a penny. It asks : why should not the little crossing-sweeper also have a fine dress on Sundays ? It is no answer to say that the child ought to be satisfied with the position in which Providence has placed it ; for you have placed it in that position. You will not understand this until you acknowledge the truth of that maxim of the Mahometan, "One hour in the execution of justice is worth seventy years of prayers."

(*ii*) *As to how the hand workers are to be paid, comforted and amused,*—the possible quantity of amusement or play for workmen depends upon their pay, which, therefore, becomes an important matter for consideration.

But we find that generally good, useful work—whether of the hand or head, – is ill paid, or not paid at all,—consider the payment of Homer or Dante. It would indeed seem that God means all thoroughly good work and talk (preaching) to be done for nothing,—compare the payment of Baruch or St. Stephen. Often the 'head-worker' is rewarded with stones.

But Ruskin assures the hand-workers that their payment cannot be as bad as that of the 'head-workers': "the worst that can happen to you is to break stones; not to be broken by them."

He also holds out before them the hope that in future all honest work will be fully paid for; that the work will be done in an orderly, soldierly, well guided, wholesome way; that it will have appointed hours and sufficient intervals of rest; and that there will be wholesome amusements,—books etc., for them during their periods of leisure.

(*d*) *Wise work and foolish work.*

There are three tests of wise work.

(i) *It is honest*—Honesty and fairness in play are recognized, but not in business. But it is the basis of all reforms.

(ii) *It is useful*—We never consider whether our work will ultimately end in something useful. The work must not injure the worker and waste his labour, for that is worse than his death. Death only shortens the worker's life but useless work corrupts it.

(iii) *Wise work is cheerful*—as a child's work is. If we wish for a thing, we must not only pray for it but work for it. Now we want the Kingdom of God to come to us. But there is a curious condition as to this Kingdom,—that only those of us who are like children can enter therein.

III. *The four characteristics of right childhood.*

(i) It is modest, because it knows that it is ignorant. A wise man also is always anxious to know more and more.

(ii) The child is faithful because it has full confidence in those who know more than it does; and, therefore, it is willing to obey them. Good workers, like soldiers, must have faith in their captains and must be prepared to obey them. Without this captainship and soldiership, no great deed, no great salvation, is within the reach of man.

(iii) Thirdly, right childhood is loving; it delights in helping people.

(iv) It is, lastly, cheerful. A great worker also is cheerful because he has faith in God. He is ever ready for play as the sun is.

Thus we may summarise the child's character in these four words—Humility, Faith, Charity, and Cheerfulness.

. Ruskin makes a passionate appeal to his hearers that they should be all converted and become as little children, for the secret of the universe can be known only by those who possess the innocence and purity of childhood.

6. Ruskin's Views on Traffic and Architecture:

(A summary of the second lecture).

I. *Taste is essentially a moral quality.*

Ruskin is not going to speak about the best architecture suitable for the Bradford Exchange, as he does not care for it very much. Nor do the Bradford merchants, who are seeking his advice as to most suitable style for building it, care for it.

Good architecture cannot be had for advice. It is the expression of national life and character; and it is produced by a prevalent and eager national taste, or desire for beauty.

The word 'Taste is often misunderstood; but all good Taste is essentially a moral quality. It is ont only a part and index of morality—it is the only morality.

It is what we like that determines what we are. For the mere doing of a right thing is not enough, if one continues to like what is wrong. But the fact is that if people resolutely do what is right, they come to like doing it in good time; and the entire object of education is to make people not merely do the right thing, but enjoy the right. thing—not merely to be industrious, but to love industry, not merely to be learned but to love knowledge—not merely to be pure, but to love purity—not merely to be just, but to hunger and thirst after justice.

Even the liking for works of art, e. g. pictures, statues etc. —if it is for 'good' works .of art,—is a moral quality. By 'good' art we do not mean 'clever' art *i. e.* what is difficult in the doing; for such art may be vicious, that is, the result of the contemplation of a vile thing. But good art is the result

of delight in the contemplation of a good and perfect thing. Delight in a fine or good work of art is thus a moral quality. Thus we conclude that what we like determines what we are and is the sign of what we are. To teach taste is inevitably to form character.

A diffusion of the right kind of taste, therefore, among the people, is sure to remove all class distinctions.

II. *National virtues and vices are indelibly written on national art.*

A nation cannot be affected by any vice, or weakness, without expressing it legibly and for ever, either in bad art, or by want of art. And there is no national virtue, small or great, which is not manifestly expressed in all the art which circumstances enable the people possessing that virtue to produce.

The English virtue of endurance and courage is seen in their iron work; their great vice of jealousy is written equally legibly on their vast military armaments.

The sight of these military preparations on the part of neighbourly nations is at once ludicrous and melancholy. No real encouragement is possible for art in the face of this huge waste.

Nor would it be a sufficient plea to say that the military expenditure was for the sake of mere amusement and play. It may be 'play' to you but not to the 'small birds' of the state.

III. *Architecture prospers or declines with national religion. It is the expression of national life. The contrast between the Gothic and the Renaissance styles.*

In brief, every nations's vice or virtue was written in its art—the soldiership of early Greece; the sensuality of late Italy; the visionary religion of Tuscany and the splendid human energy and beauty of Venice.

It is significant that in modern England churches and schools are built in the Gothic style and mills and mansions are not built in that style. This was not so in the Middle Ages, when the places of worship as well as of residence had the same style. The difference of style cleary means that religion has been separated from life.

This difference in style is the result of the habit of regard-

ing only the church as the house of God. But the story of Jacob's dream shows that any place may become the house of God and the gate of heaven.

To suppose that God resides only in the church is gross Judaism. The true temple is not the church, but our own hearts.

To say so is not to take away from the honour of the churches, but only to recognise that our houses and our hills are sacred,—in fact, the whole of this earth.

This has been the burden of all my former writings *e. g.* "*The Seven Lamps of Architecture*" and "*The Stones of Venice*," to point out the contrast between the conditions under which was reared the Gothic architecture of Venice (which was the result of pure national faith and of domestic virtue), and the Renaissance architecture of Italy (which was the result of national infidelity and domestic corruption).

But though good architecture is essentially religious i. e. the production of a faithful and virtuous people, we must guard ourselves against the error of thinking that it is ecclesiastical i. e. the work of the clergy. It was not ecclesiastical; the clergy even debased it by making of it an instrument for promoting superstition.

The cloister and the crusade were the two forms of this superstition—one the result of perverted faith, the other resulting in waste and war.

The essence of my past teaching has been that every great national architecture has been the result and exponent of a great national religion, that it is not the hieroglyphic writing of an initiated priest-hood but the manly language of a people inspired by a resolute and common purpose. It renders resolute and common fidelity to the legible laws of an undoubted God.

IV. *Illustrations from the Three Architectural Styles of Europe* :—

There have been three distinct schools of European architecture, corresponding to three great religions :

(*a*) the Greek—which was the worship of the God of Wisdom and Power.

(*b*) the Medieval—which was the worship of the God of

(*c*) the Renaissance—which was the worship of the God of Pride and Beauty.

(*a*) The Greek conception of Deity can be gathered from a proper interpretation of the representation of Athena, the Goddess of Wisdom,—Greek architecture being unerring, bright, clearly defined, and self-contained.

(*b*) Medieval religion was essentially the religion of comfort. It laid too much stress on sin and sickness. The practical result of this doctrine, in art, was a continual contemplation of sin and purification, giving rise to an architecture—at one time melancholy and severe, at another luxuriant. This kind of architecture is the basest, when base people employ the style, and the noblest when used by the noble.

V. *Reasons for the Decline of the Three Architectural Styles:*

It should be noted that the Greek religion perished when it began to pursue false philosophy, and the medieval religion perished when it remitted sin lyingly i. e. not by ending it, but by compounding for the same.'

The Renaissance religion was one of Pleasure.—Its downfall was due to luxury.

Each of these religions expressed itself in vast temples: the Greek in the Parthenon, the medieval in 'temples' built to Virgin Mary; and the Renaissance in the Vatican and the Versailles.

VI. *The present religion of England. A good architecture for Exchanges is possible only if the market has its heroisms.*

You have in England at present two religions—one mominal (Christianity), about which you talk and dispute and to which you give only a fraction of your wealth and time; and the other—, the practical religion (Money Making or Mammon-Worship) about which you are unanimous and which absorbs most of your time and energy. We may call the ruling goddess of this religion "the Goddess of Getting-on" or 'Britannia of the Market.' The architecture appropriate to her assumes the form of railway-stations, factory-chimneys, ware-houses, exchanges etc.

Good architecture is possible for an Exchange if there is heroism in the fact or deed of exchange; for only heroic acts are the proper subjects for sculpture and painting, which adorn architecture.

Though it is true that Christ disliked exchange, heroism is still possible in that art. It is strange that we should regard an act of war or devastation as a heroic act, but not so the doing of a serviceable deed e. g feeding the hungry or clothing the naked.

Contrast the work and pay of a soldier with those of a merchant. There is a small, though regular, payment for the hard work of the former, and large and speculative profit for the light work of the latter.

Good architecture is possible for Exchange only if com. merce is carried on according to soldierly principles i. e. with heroism and sacrifice.

Ruskin offers ironical suggestions for decorating the Exchange.

VII. *The Two characteristics of the Goddess of Getting-on.*

The "Goddess of Getting-on" differs from the Greek and medieval deities in two things—first, as to the continuance of her presumed power, and secondly as to its extent.

(i) *Continuance*:—The Goddess of Wisdom gives increase of wisdom and the Goddess of Comfort gives increase of comfort. Similiarly the Goddess of Getting-on gives increase of money. But what is the use of all this money? It is useless if it is not spent; and it is just with respect to the mode of spending it that Political Economy remains silent.

(ii) *Its Extent*:—The Goddesses of Wisdom and Comfort are for all men; but the Goddess of Getting-on is for the rich only. The comforts and luxuries of the rich votaries of the Goddess,—mansions, stables, parks, clothes etc.—depend upon the monotonous, toilsome and degrading work of the many. To the latter, she is not the Goddess of Getting-on.

It is true that this kind of work has got to be done, and there would be those who would get it done. But it does not follow. therefore, that such captains of industry should keep all the profits to themselves. Nor should even a king consume all the profits of the nation's work. A real king, on the contrary, takes the least possible quantity of the nation's work for himself. But such (political) kingships—howsoever splendid they may be—ultimately expire in ruin and only the true kingships survive,—those which are of royal labourers governing loyal labourers.

Neither a king nor a captain of industry shonld appropriate

to himself all the produce of a piece of land, or a mill, or a mine.

VIII. *An Appeal to the 'Captains' of Labour.*—

This state of things must change: it depends upon you whether the change is for better or for worse.

The wrong done to the poor may not have been done deliberately; it may be the result of the perverted teaching of Political Economy that to do the best for oneself is to do the best for others. But the truth is that to do the best for others is to do the best for oneself.

We must fix our eyes upon a more fundamental principle than money.

The Greek philosopher, Plato, in his dialogue called '*Critias*", has depicted the downfall of man. Man, in the beginning, had divine nature in him, and so long as it lasted, he was loving and virtuous. But when, in course of time, the divine part in him faded and the human element preponderated, he was filled with all the iniquity of inordinate possession and power, to the great disappointment of the God of Gods.

Such are the consequences of setting up riches as the idol of worship. It has been forbidden by Christ, and so long as you worship it, no progress is possible in Art or Science. It will lead to disaster. But if you adopt a simple order of existence, noble buildings are possible; not only good buildings built with stone but better temples,—temples that are not made with hands.

7. Ruskin's views on War, Kingship and Soldiersh p.

(A Summary of the third lecture).

I. *The Arts of Peace are founded on War.*

A writer on painting, like Ruskin, may not have anything to say touching the special business of the soldier.

But in response to repeated requests, he is going to address a few words especially as war is not unconnected with art. Indeed, all the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war; no great art ever yet rose on earth, but among a nation of soldiers. Art is incompatible with pastoral, agricultural, commercial, or manufacturing pursuits.

The assertion that war is the foundation of all great art may comes as a surprise. Ruskin himself had seen three of the

masterpieces of the great Venetian painter, Tintoret, torn to rags by the bomb-shells of the Austrian army.

(*Historical illustrations.*)—But a careful comparison of the states of great historic races at different periods leads to that inevitable conclusion. Let us examine the conditions of the rise of Art in Egypt, in Greece, in Rome, and in Europe generally during the Middle Ages.

In Egypt where religion meant a perpetual contemplation of death and where priests and soldiers were the ruling castes, works of art were represented by sculptures of kings going out to battle or receiving the homage of conquered armies.

In Greece, the subjects of poetry and painting are drawn from war or warlike exercises. Their deities also. e. g. Apollo and Athena are deities at once of wisdom and war.

But the Greeks were superior to the Egyptians in (a) not having a soldier caste and (b) not despising agricultural and pastoral life. For this reason they reached the highest rank of wise manhood, and Europe is culturally indebted to them.

But war alone will not produce art; there must be the art instinct in the genius of the people. This art instinct is wholly wanting among the Romans, and hence, in spite of their martial qualities, the arts were extinguished in Roman hands.

The arts were revived during the age of chivalry when war was loved for the sake of war; and we got the noblest representations of Art—in Italy, France, Spain, and finally Venice—the Italian city.

With the advent of peace and luxury, the arts decline in Europe generally, except in France and England, where the martial instinct remains intact.

It cannot be argued that the arts deserve to perish if they flourish only because of war. For it is only during the periods of war the highest virtues and faculties of man are called forth, and the arts are valuable as an expression of those virtues and faculties.

The common notion that the virtues of civil life flourish in peace is a delusion. Peace brings in its train sensuality, corruption and death.

II. *There are three kinds of war* :—

All war is not the foundation of art e. g. wars of devastation or aggression. But the creative or foundational war is that in

which the natural restlessness and love of contest among men are disciplined, by consent, into modes of beautiful—though it may be fatal—play, in which the natural ambition and the love of power of men are disciplined into the aggressive conquest of surrounding evil; and in which the natural instincts of self-defence are sanctified by the noblest of institutions and by the purity of the households which they are appointed to defend. The three kinds can also be described as follows:—*war of exercise or play*; *war for dominion*; *and*, *war for defence*.

(a) *war for play*:—

The population of the world is broadly divisible into two classes—the workers, and the players. The latter find, in the passion and peril of battle, the only satisfying fulfilment of their unoccupied being.

But if the idlers wish to have war for the sake of play or pastime, they and they alone should undertake its risks and dangers; they should not wage it by staking the lives of the poor. Nor should women encourage this kind of war.

Even if we grant for the sake of argument that wars are fought, not for the sake of play but because they are inevitable in the settlement of political quarrels, it does not follow that they should be fought out with the lives of the poor. You fight out your private quarrels at your own risk. Why should not a public quarrel be concluded in the same way?

But as a matter of fact whenever two government fall out, they cunningly use the poor to fight out their quarrel. Cf. Carlyle's description of the fight between the thirty of an English Dumdrudge with the thirty of a French Dumdrudge.

But though you should not play the game of battle with the lives of your servants, there is nothing wrong in your having a love for it. A fair fight is the best of play, better than cricket (batting), much better than gambling (betting).

But this is true only of that game of war in which the full personal power of the human creature is brought out in the management of its weapons.

This is so for three reasons:

(i) Because only such kind of fighting can be a proper test of the physical and mental qualities of man. The fear of imme-

diate death alone can furnish such a trial of the fineness of frame and the firmness of hand of a man and not any other extraneous circumstance e. g. his argument, resources etc.

(ii) Because only such kind of fighting diminishes the destructiveness of war and,

(iii) finally causes the least distress to the poor.

In these respects, this kind of fighting is in sharp contrast with "modern" war, which leads to the destruction of so much material wealth and of so many lives.

Though such wars may be inevitable in the future account of the progress of science, wars were not so destructive in ancient times.

Compare, for example, Muller's description of the fighting of the Spartans—the greatest soldiers of antiquity.

Contrast with it the preparation for and the cost of a modern battle, e. g. the contrast between the decisive battle of Corinth and the indecisive battle of Gettysburg.

(b) *War of Dominion.—*

We shall consider this desire for dominion as entertained by kings and by nations.

We start by expressing the conviction that human nature is essentially a noble and beautiful thing and not a foul or base thing ; that the captain of a sinking ship who (after the passengers were saved) chose to go down with his crew, acted according to human nature, and not the mother who allowed her little child to be suffocated while she was talking outside.

Much depends upon whether you regard the first or the second incident as typical of 'human' nature.

But the broad fact is that a number of the highest human race is invariably both kind and true. As you lower the race, you get cruelty and falseness. This, is also seen in the derivation of the two words 'generous' and 'gentle', which, in their origin meant "of pure race," but are now synonyms for "virtue".

When, therefore, we know that human nature is essentially noble and capable of magnificent self-sacrifice, it is inconceivable that a prince, well-born and well-educated, should, instead of being on the side of the poor, oppress them.

Contrast the position and the behaviour of the captain of the

ship Ruskin referred to with that of the captain (king) of a nation. The former bravely faces death for the safety of his passengers, but the latter only taxes his subjects for his personal luxury!

(b-2) *The meaning of power:* —

But if such rulers of great multitudes of men had formed a proper conception of their duty to their subjects they would never have fought wars for the sake of mere increase of dominion; for they would have found that the duties of governing even a small piece of territory, with a view to the happiness of the governed, were sufficiently absorbing.

But if the rulers desired increase of territory, for the mere sake of more extensive exercise of authority, regardless of the result of such exercise, then they might add as much territory as they liked to their possessions.

But extension of territory does not mean increase of power; for all power, properly so called, is wise and benevolent. There is no true potency but that of help; nor true ambition, but ambition to save.

This true power—the power of saving—depends neither on the multitude of men, nor on the extension of territory. It lies in the men, and in their unity and virtue, not in their standing-room; a select group of men of wise hearts is better than a wilderness of fools; and only that nation gains true territory, which gains itself.

The ultimate strength of a nation lies, not in the mere increase of numbers or extension of territory, but in its capacity for kindness and justice. When a nation conquers a subject race, whether such a conquest is a source of power of weakness to the conquering nation will depend upon whether its influence on the native race is benevolent and exalting or otherwise.

But though war for dominion is not desirable, it does not mean that all aggressive war is to be shunned. Such an aggressive war may be forced upon a nation in a noble cause. The policy of non-intervention on such an occasion is as selfish and cruel as the worst frenzy of conquest, and dastardly.

(c) *War for Defence:*—

A young man entering the army considers that his primary

duty is the defence of his country, and the maintenance and the execution of her laws. But the laws of this defensive war must be carefully analysed.

You first entered the army probably upon purely 'sentimental' considerations e. g. love of excitement or of gaudy dress. Perhaps in the best of you, the sentimental or 'peacocky' motives were mixed with a stern sense of duty, but the latter was never the principal motive. Now, so far as your choice is sentimental, you enjoy military life and you are happy in dying a brave death.

But so far as your choice is the result of a sense of duty, you really turn yourselves into a weapon of defence in the hands of your masters, to be used or not used by them, as they deem proper.

This implicit obedience to your masters may be a noble quality, but after all, it is a state of slavery. You are slaves in so far as you are driven to your work, of whatever kind, and without thought, at another's bidding. You are slaves in so far as you are paid a price, though your purchase-money be praise.

But in this taking the vow of slavery to your masters, you must also consider what kind of masters you will serve and what kind of work they will put you to. There is no harm if the masters (Government) were the best and the noblest section of the country; but if they are all selfish and mean—shopkeepers, and merchants,—whose servants would you be? Under them, you will only be the police of their manufacturing towns and the beadles of their little Bethels.

It thus follows that the ideal of soldiership does not consist in mere passive obedience and bravery; and that the separation of civil from military power may prove disastrous to a state. It would prove particularly so in modern times when all that is best in a nation—its soul-substance—is formed into armies. The control and direction of such armies rest in the hands of civil authorties who possibly represent the elements that are cowardly, sensual, avaricious, and faithless in the country:

Thus your vow requires you to defend not any country but a country that possesses domestic virtues and righteous laws, and whose honour has been in any way challenged or endangered.

A nation not possessing virtues or honour i. e. a corrupt

nation only deserves a military despotism. But in a healthy state, the rulers are its soldiers and the soldiers its rulers.

At present the condition of England has become deplorable because of the division of labour between her brave men fighting and her cowards governing. They attribute the greatness of England not to her past wisdom, or her qualities of head and heart, but to her cheap and abundant coal.

Greatness is still possible for England in spite of the disfigurement of her land and the degradation of her people on account of mining and manufacture, if her soldiers not only fight for her, but also think and feel for her.

III *Practical Suggestions to the young Soldiers.*

Your fitness as a soldier when you grow old depends upon what you do now. No good soldier in his old age was ever careless or indolent in his youth. One can afford to become thoughtless and indolent in one's old age, but not in one's youth when the whole of one's future is in the balance.

Once you resolve not to waste the days of youth your duties may be summed up in two words—*industry and honour.*

As to industry—Your profession requires not only a firm body, but also an active mind; and all knowledge, which to others may mean little more than means of amusement, is of great practical importance to you. You cannot afford to be idle, for the lives of those under your command depend upon your knowledge. "Lost moments now will be lost lives then, and every instant which you carelessly take for play, you buy with blood."

You must also guard yourself against wasting time in betting which is the vilest of habits.

As to honour—You must be men of honour in the highest sense of the word. Though modern war is quite different from mediaeval war, the true qualities of a knight are not the less necessary now. You must have courage, truth and and gentleness. Remember that your hearts are as tombs in which a god lies buried; you must regard yourselves as crusaders fighting for the redemption of that sacred sepulchre. Above all, you must be true to women.

IV. An Appeal to Women.

We must finally consider the part that women have to play

in the lives of soldiers. Doubtless, women suffer a great deal for the sake of the soldiers—the pangs of separation, anxiety etc. But their trial is not over with these sufferings. They must pray for them and guard them, not when they are in danger, but when they are face to face with temptation.

Women's influence and rule over soldiers is decisive. The soldiers will be what women want them to be. You should not suppose that a wife's rule should be over her husband's house, and not over his mind. In fact, a true wife, in her husband's house, is his servant. But in his heart she is queen.

Though I have spoken to-night in praise of war, I would fain have peace. But the fact that there is no peace is the fault of women. Women suffer for those whom they love, but they are indifferent to those who are not within their immediate circle. But if the results of war in any way affected women, there would be no more wars. For instance, if all of them vowed to wear black as a sign of mourning for all the men that fell in a war, no war would last a week.

Women must, finally, care more for what the Bible teaches them to do. The Bible teaches them 'to do judgme and justice,' but they do not care to know what the biblical word 'justice' means. If they understand it well, there will be no more wars. Or there will only be righteous wars.

(8) Ruskin's Views on Education.

Mr. Cook has carefully summarised Ruskin's views on Education in Ch. XXVI. of Vol. II of his biography. In the first place, it is to be noted that education is an ethical rather than an intellectual process. "Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know. It means teaching them to behave as they do not behave." Thus education cannot be tested by mere acquisition of knowledge or by competitive examinations. Education, being an ethical process, is not directed to success in life. "You do not learn that you may live, you live that you may learn." True education is, in itself, an advancement in Life. "He only is advancing in life whose heart is getting softer, whose blood warmer, whose brain quicker; whose spirit is entering into living Peace."

In the second place, the diffusion of education will not equalise all men. Education is not a "means of getting on in the

world, but a means of staying pleasantly in your place there." Thus there should be education for children of every rank and its main elements should be; (a) physical education that will make the body beautiful and perfect; (b) the inculcation of Reverence and Compassion, and Truth—of spirit and word, and of thought and deed.

But modern society is so constituted that the existence of the 'upper' class is rendered possible by the ignorance and degrading labour of the 'lower' class. "You imply that a certain portion of mankind must be employed in degrading work; and that, to fit them for this work, it is necessary to limit their knowledge, their active powers, and their enjoyments, from childhood upwards, so that they may not be able to conceive of any state better than the one they were born in, nor possess any knowledge or acquirements inconsistent with the coarseness of their vulgar occupation. And by their labour in this contracted state of mind, we superior beings are to be maintained."

Time and Tide § 104.

How to bridge this inevitable gulf between the 'upper' and 'lower' classes is the main problem. It cannot be denied that a great deal of necessary work is 'servile' in the accurate sense i. e., it sinks a man to the condition of a serf, or worker,—a state proper for an animal, but too bestial for man. If this is so, it is the duty of all persons in higher stations of life, by every means in their power, to diminish their demand for work of such kind, and to live with as little aid from the lower trades, as they can possibly contrive. The duty of a rich man is thus to take the simplest food, clothes, lodgings etc. lest by his 'demand' for useless luxuries he puts poor men to their production and thus degrades them. Of course, if luxuries could be had without the degradation of those who work at them, as works of art are, they need not be shunned.

"And the degree in which you recognise the difference between these two kinds of services, is precisely what makes the difference between your being a civilized person or a barbarian. If you keep slaves to furnish forth your dress,—to glut your stomach— sustain your indolence, or deck your pride, you are a barbarian. If you keep servants, properly cared for, to furnish you with what you verily want, and no more than that,

—you are a 'civil' person—a person capable of the qualities of citizenship." § 131. *Time and Tide.*

Class-distinctions were, in the beginning, based upon birth. In course of time, three upper classes arose: those who were physically strong conquered or occupied more land; those who were industrious and prudent accumulated more money; and those who were superior in intellectual pursuits acquired honour, and developed the arts.

From this natural division into three classes of the 'upper' ranks of society, we can deduce their proper functions: (1) the proper function of the strong is the restraint and punishment of vice, and the general maintenance of law and order; (2) of the prudent and the industrious, to provide for the foolish, the weak and the idle, and to direct in right channels the labour of the poor; (3) of the scholars and artists, to teach and delight the inferior multitude.

It generally happens, however, that the 'upper classes'—this natural aristocracy—get corrupted, the more certainly and sooner if they abandon themselves to luxuries. But even when so corrupted, the aristocracy of any nation may be divided into three classes: (1) the landed proprietors and soldiers,—essentially a political body (for the possession of land can only be maintained by military power): (2) the moneyed men and leaders of commerce; (3) the professional men and masters in science, art and literature. § 142. *Time and Tide.*

Plato cared only for the education of 'gentlemen' and neglected the slaves'. But Ruskin wants both masters and servants to be educated. According to him, no amount of education will remove the essential difference between the worthy and the worthless. Education is just a means of discrimination between them. The worthless should be put to rough work. That is the kind of education *for them.*

In the three lectures in *The Crown of Wild Olive*, Ruskin is, in a way, concerned with the education of workers, merchants and soldiers. He wants them to be trained for the right kind of life. The ideas developed in the preceding paragraphs find frequent expression in *The Crown of Wild Olive.* In his lecture on Work, Ruskin lays down the law regarding education: "No teacher can truly promote the cause of education, until he knows the conditions of the life for which that educa-

tion is to prepare his pupil." The manner of the amusement and the matter of the teaching will depend on whether the distinction between class and class is healthy and real. In this connection, Ruskin hints that the object of education is to efface the distinction for ever and make a thinker work and a worker think, though rough men may have to do rough work and noble men, noble.

Having thus pleaded for a democratisation of education Ruskin defines its object in 'Traffic'. "The entire object of education is to make people not merely *do* the right things, but *enjoy* the right things—not merely industrious, but to love industry—not merely learned, but to love knowledge—not merely pure but to love purity—not merely just, but to hunger and thirst after justice."

In his lecture on 'War' Ruskin advises the young soldiers to cultivate two virtues, industry and honour. This can be extended to all students, irrespective of the profession for which they are trained. Ruskin does not believe in separating soldiers from intellectuals and *vice versa*. He tells the soldiers "Gentlemen I tell you solemnly, that the day is coming when the soldiers of England must be her tutors; and the captains of her army, captains also of her mind."

(9) Ruskin's views on the Relation of Art to Religion and Morality.

Ruskin has summarised in a clear manner his views on this subject in his third lecture in the *Queen of the Air*.

"We continually talk of the faults and merits of architecture as of their virtues and vices. What do we mean by talking of the faults of a picture, or the merits of a piece of stone? The faults of a work of art are the faults, of its workman, and its virtues, his virtues. Great art is the expression of the mind of a great man, and mean art that of the want of mind of a weak man. A foolish person builds foolishly, and a wise one sensibly, a virtuous one, beautifully; and a vicious one, basely...So that when once you have learnt how to spell this most precious of all legends—pictures and buildings,—you may read the characters of men, and of nations, in their art, as in a mirror......If the work is a cobweb, you know it was made by a spider; if a honey-comb, by a bee; a worm-cast is thrown up by a worm, and

a nest wreathed by a bird; and a house built by a man, worthily, if he is worthy, and ignobly, if he is ignoble."

"We may thus say of any work of art, that no man could have done it but exactly the man who did it; and by looking close at it you may, if you know your letters, read precisely the manner of man he was."

"Herein lies the essential difference between manufacture and Art: the former is the work of hands only: the latter is the work of the whole spirit of man, and as that spirit is, so is the deed of it."

There is an equally vital relation between Art and the moral state of a nation. In this connection Ruskin distinguishes three stages in the history of a people—the military stage, the domestic stage and the stage of luxury. In the first stage the whole nation lives a hard and warlike life. The nation is always its own army, and their king, or chief head of government, is always their first soldier. Pharoah, or David, or Leonidas, or Valerius, or Barbarossa, or Cœur de Lion, or St. Louis, or Dandolo—Egyptian, Jew, Greek, Roman, German, English, French, Venetian,—that is inviolable law for them all; their king must be their first soldier, or they cannot be in progressive power.

After their great military period comes the domestic period during which, without betraying the discipline of war, they add to their great soldiership the delights and possesions of a delicate and tender home life; and then, for all nations, is the time of their perfect art, which is the fruit, the evidence, the reward of their national ideal of character, developed by the finished care of the occupations cf peace.

This great period is always followed by the day of luxury. Art is pursued for pleasure only and its decline sets in.

§ 102—105 Q. of A.

From this we may deduce two axioms; (1) *The foundation of art in moral character*; (2) and next, the foundation of moral character in war.

(1) We must of course distinguish between the art instinct and amiability of character; for a good man is not necessarily a painter, nor does an eye for colour necessarily imply an honest mind. But great art implies the union of both powers;

it is the artistic expression of a pure soul. If the gift is not there, we can have no great art at all; and if the soul is not there, the art is bad, however dexterous. In the end, the art-gift itself is the result of moral development.

(2) *About the foundation of moral character in war.* The reason for this too manifest fact is, that, until now, it has been impossible for any nation, except a warrior one, to fix its mind wholly on its men, instead of on their possessions. Every great soldier nation thinks, necessarily, first of multiplying its bodies and souls of men, in good temper and strict discipline. As long as this is its political aim, it does not matter what it temporarily suffers, or loses, either in number or in wealth; its morality and its arts (if it have national art-gift) advance together; but so soon as it ceases to be a warrior nation, it thinks of its possessions instead of its men; and then the moral and poetic powers vanish together.

But this is true of war only if it is waged by personal strength, not by machinery or money. A nation that fights with a mercenary force, or with torpedoes, instead of its own arms, is dying. § 106—§ 115 Q. of A.

It will thus be seen that the connection between Art, Morality, and War is vital in the eyes of Ruskin. It had a close bearing upon the conditions of England which he sought to improve. Thus he says in § 75 *Time and Tide*—"I believe that the imminent danger to which we are now in England exposed by the gradually accelerated fall of our aristocracy (wholly their own fault), and the substitution of money power for their martial one; and by the correspondingly imminent prevalence of mob violence here, as in America; together with the continually increasing chances of insane war, founded on popular passion whether of pride, fear, or acquisitiveness, —all these dangers being further darkened and degraded by the monstrous forms of vice and selfishness which the appliances of recent wealth, and of vulgar mechanical art, make possible to the million,—will soon bring us into a condition in which men will be glad to listen to almost any words but those of a demagogue, and to seek any means of safety rather than those in which they have lately trusted." (Cf. § 123 of *War.*)

Ruskin's view that Art is the expression of national morality has been called in question by Frederic Harrison.

He points out that the pictures of Perugino, Titian, and Tintoretto were painted in societies corrupt and sensual to the core; that one type of Greek sculpture was actually inspired by a detestable vice; and that even in architecture, the generalization is not correct. "Among the noblest buildings ever raised by man we must count the Parthenon at Athens the Pantheon at Rome, the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, and St. Paul's in London. The Parthenon was nearly contemporary with the comedies of Aristophanes and the Sophists of Athens—not with Marathon and Aeschylus; the Pantheon with the Satires of Juvenal and the epigrams of Martial; St. Sophia's was built by the husband of the Empress of Theodora, and St. Paul was built in the era of Charles II and James II. These buildings synchronise with some of the most scathing satires upon personal and social corruption that survive in Greek, Latin, Byzantine, and English Literature." (Fr. Har. 64—66.)

Similarly, it may be pointed out that Ruskin circumscribes his argument too narrowly, in identifying art with the outward expression of a healthy conscience. Beauty may be the concrete, final expression of rightness. But rightness of what? "Not necessarily of conduct, surely, but of feeling." Ruskin's condemnation of Teniers' picture of sots quarrelling over their dice is not justified because it makes too much of the theme selected by the painter. At the same time we must grant that a picture is something more than 'an ingenious arrangement of pigments'. We can emphasise sincerity and truthfulness but without undervaluing technique. Ruskin's error lies in the fact that he makes art a "function', in the scientific sense, of national morality, varying in excellence along with it. He often had to meet the retort that much good and even noble art has arisen among nations which cannot be credited with special elevations of purity or morals...The retort, however, does not dispose of Ruskin's principle, but only shows that it is too simple. An 'age' is not all of a piece...If we think of the servile basis and of the sexual code of the community from which the Dialogues (Plato's) emerged, apparently like flowers from a dunghill, the proposition that art is a function of national morality will be seen to be neither wholly true nor wholly idle. An art like that of Balzac, which portrays the whole of

a society in its heights and depths, presents yet other riddles for which Ruskin's canon is inadequate," (Prof. Elton). But it was because Ruskin 'drove an undeniable truth too far' that he 'provoked the revulsion which became so marked towards the end of the century',—art for art's sake. We would be cut off from the 'appreciation of many good artists and writers' if we were to follow Ruskin in this respect.

It must also be admitted in fairness to Ruskin, that he repeatedly declared that virtue could not make any man an artist or any nation artistic. "A mass of his writings, both critical and pedagogic (such as the Elements of Drawing) is concerned purely with execution. He has left a great body of judgments on particular painters, which are entirely concerned with the way in which they did their work, apart from the question of their ulterior motives." Thus in his statements about art—as, for instance, about that picture being the greatest which conveyed to the mind of the spectator the greatest number of ideas—Ruskin only drove an undeniable truth too far.

The great service that Ruskin did to art was to make the public realise the truth that "art was no longer to be regarded as an embellishment of life, but a thing necessary to its redemption from brutality, a thing necessary to make life human. It is no toy for the luxurious few, but an essential possession for the commonwealth at large".

Thus, for Ruskin, Art is Religion. "By Religion is meant "the feelings of love, reverence or dread with which the human mind is affected by its conceptions of spiritual Being". Recognise this spiritual Being and name it as you will. If you recognise it and, recognising revere, you are religious; and Art, as the interpreter of Beauty, is the prime agent in showing you noble grounds for such noble emotions. In this sense every great art is necessarily religious".

10. Ruskin's views on Architecture and on the Gothic style.

a) The Seven Lamps and The Stones of Venice.

In *The Seven Lamps* and in *The Stones of Venice*, he develops the view that architecture is the expression of

national morality. Architecture is a nation's autobiography. As Prof. Norton says; "This fundamental doctrine is sound and needs to be enforced today, no less than forty years ago. It is, that in architecture, as well as in the other fine arts, the final test of the excellence of a work is the spirit of which it is the expression, and of which it gives evidence alike in its design and its execution—evidence all the more convincing, because of its unintentional and inevitable charcter."

In the *Stones of Venice* Ruskin unravelled the story of Venice by means of her architecture. On the whole this method of interpreting the history of a nation has been now allowed to be a right one. The conclusions at which Ruskin arrived are in substantial agreement with the facts of history. Before the days of Ruskin even competent authorities like Gibbon regarded the architecture of Venice as 'barbarous.'. But when Ruskin showed it to be the expression of the noblest period of Venetian history, a new light was thrown on it.

Not only did Ruskin interpret the meaning of Venetian Gothic; he also took a prominent part in the revival of this style of architecture in England. A number of the public buildings of his time were built in this style chiefly because of his initiative. Ruskin pleaded for the extension of this style to all kinds of buildings, instead of confining it to churches only. He showed that when architecture is truly national, 'its spirit pervades the temple and the palace alike.'

He preferred Gothic to other styles because of its influence upon the workmen. The test of good ornament he formulated as follows: Was it done from the heart? Was the workman happy while he was doing it? He found that the virtue of Gothic architecture lay in the free play it gave to individual fancy, and that the highest achievement in architecture was possible when the artist was craftsman, and the craftsman artist. As Ruskin himself wrote: "The chief purpose with which, twenty years ago, I undertook my task of the history of Venetian architecture was to show the dependance of its beauty on the happiness and fancy of the workman, and to show also that no architect could claim the title to the authority of magister unless he himself wrought at the head of his men, captain of manual skill, as the best knight is captain of armies." When Venice flourished in the days of the best strength of the

Republic, her architecture was the noblest but at the time of the Renaissance her vitality was gone, and her architecture was reduced to mere formalism.

Ruskin believed that 'true' Gothic was impossible under modern conditions because of the great chasm between the architects and the craftsmen. As he says in his Preface to *The Two Paths:—*

"Study Italian Gothic?—perhaps it would be as well; build with pointed arches? there is no objection; use solid stone and well-burnt brick?—by all means: but —learn to carve or paint organic form ourselves? How can such a thing be asked? We are above all that. The carvers and painters are our servants and quite subordinate people. They ought to be glad if we leave room for them."

But so long as this chasm was not removed, architects could have only the outer form of Gothic, without its soul.

(b) *His Limitations as a Critic of Architecture.*

Ruskin had certain defects as a critic of art and architecture. He could not see the obscure motive-power of change. The Renaissance architecture superseded the Gothic because 'the old order changeth yielding place to new.' He deals with the *processes* of the construction of buildings and determines on these considerations their degree of excellence; he does not deal with buildings themselves as works of art. "August Comte had long before spoken of medieval cathedrals as the most perfect expression of the ideas and feelings of man's moral nature. But to extend this law to all forms of art and to give it the absolute character that Ruskin attempted, involves us in hopeless paradox and mischievous absurdities." One of his radical defects is that he undertook to found a comprehensive scheme of the imaginative faculties on a creed (Puritanism) which he had imbibed as a child and held with childlike fervour, without any solid study of its philosophy or its history. Gradually he got rid of this. All that genius and insight could do without systematic learning or patient reasoning, Ruskin did. But architecture cannot be viewed from the aesthetic point of view alone and many researches in archaeology since Ruskin have thrown a flood of light on what he did not know. Thus he did not understand the real relation of the buildings and arts he found at Venice

to their sources in the Byzantine school and in Greek invention; nor did he then know the far-radiating influence of Byzantine art on the West. He assigned the ornament over the gate of an ancient Greek city to 1300 A. D. or so. But it was really designed in 1600 A. D. Again, the strangeness of his arguments, the perverse nature of his judgments and his blindness to certain forms of beauty simply bewilder us. The real explanation lies in the fact that he was fundamentally a *teacher* and not a critic, a propagandist and not a disinterested enquirer.

(c) *Ruskin's conception of architecture as a fine art*:

'Architect' is derived from a Greek word meaning master-builder. Architecture is the art of building in accordance with principles determined, not merely by the purposes the edifice is intended to serve, but by high considerations of beauty and harmony. It cannot be defined as the art of building simply or even of building well. The purpose of building as such is convenience and use irrespective of appearance; and the employment of materials to this end is regulated by the mechanical principles of constructive art. But the aim of achitecture as an art is so to arrange the plan and enrichments of a structure as to impart to it interest, grandeur, unity, beauty, power. An architect must have imagination as well as technical skill,

Ruskin approved of this approach and made it his own by adding to it some special views: (1) In *The Seven Lamps*, he sets forth his idea of Architecture by distinguishing between Architecture and Building: "Architecture is that art which, taking up and admitting, as conditions of its working, the necessities and common uses of the building, impresses on its form certain characters venerable or beautiful, but otherwise unnecessary. Thus no one would call the laws architectural which determine the height of a breast work or the position of a bastion. But if to the stone-facing of the bastion be added an unnecessary feature as a cable.moulding, *that* is architecture." In his lecture on Architecture at the University of Oxford, he repeated the same view. If the architect is not a sculptor or a painter, he can only be a *builder*. But still we cannot but feel that architecture is all the greater as an art if it produces its effect without superfluity. (2) His attempt to weave ethics and aesthetics into a single texture is again an extreme step. But at the same time we must remember that Architecture is

the most social and national of all the arts and is affected by the moral tone dominant in society and by the national ideals in vogue ; and that fot the simple reason that all great buildings are raised by the public for the use of the public. (3) The need for the liberty of the workmen. This will be discussed in detail in the next section.

(*d*) *The social element in his criticism of architecture and the revival of Gothic.*

Ruskin was the apostle of medievalism in architecture. Many of the thinkers and artists of his day,—The Pre-Raphaelites, for instance,—were dissatisfied with their environment and went to the past for inspiration. Ruskin preached the revival of the Gothic style in architecture because he found in it all the principles he loved,—naturalism, morality, religion, the liberty of the workman and individual beauty. Ruskin himself disliked modern civilization,—its machinery and soullessness. This very tendency of his developed later into the idea of St. George's Guild. His theory of medievalism in art was but a beginning in this direction.

But it is not possible to revive Gothic. The 'Commercial renaissance' of New London drifted away from Ruskin's Gothic. The two chief cathedrals in modern times—those in Westminster and Liverpool—are Byzantine in style. To realise Ruskin's ideal of Gothic, even the humblest workman must be religious. But there is practically no religious feeling now among the working classes. Secular creeds like socialism have taken the place of religion,—or none at all. In these days, when a church or any other building has to be erected at great speed, there is no time left for the leisurely style of Gothic. Great Gothic buildings bear witness to the labour of love. But all architectural activity is in the hands of commercial contractors and they would be reluctant to take to the Gothic style because of the cost of labour involved it it. Finally, the tendency to-day is to use money for philanthropic rather than social purpcses. In insisting on Gothic, Ruskin did not see the motive-power of change. It is in the nature of things that one school of architecture should give way to another.

At the same time it must be acknowledged that Ruskin's

insistence on Gothic brought into full relief certain great principles and set contemporary art on the right path.

The second social element in Ruskin's criticism of architecture is his view of it as representing the civilization of a nation. He attributes the greatness of medieval architecture to the religious fervour of the time. He condemns the Renaissance style because of its pride of knowledge and its thirst for technical perfection. And he denounces his own age for its soullessness, machinery and the slavery of the workman all of which together make the production of great architecture impossible.

Ruskin curiously fell short of realising the greatness of the Renaissance.

While he discovered much symbolic significance in Gothic buildings, he condemned those of the Renaissance violently. The licentiousness prevalent at the time of the Renaissance was probably the cause of this prejudice. This insensitiveness to other types of beauty must be counted among his great defects. But it must also be said that this sort of prejudice to what is inimical to their preaching is common to *all* great thinkers. In the fervour of their own doctrine, they do not care to realise what justice there is on the other side.

Above all what Ruskin emphasised was, that architecture was fundamentally a human concern and hence more or less the index of the civilization of every age. And to drive home this doctrine he even availed himself of minor points : The Roman Christian architecture is said to be the exact expression of the Christianity of the time,—very fervid and beautiful but very imperfect : in many respects ignorant, and yet radiant with a strong, childlike light of imagination. He points out that in the middle ages gorgeous colour was loved in dress as well as in architecture.

But the same figure-sculpture cannot be prevalent now because the present-day style of dress is the ugliest. Hence he advises his age to take up floral sculpture.

But the most important social element in his criticism is that which concerns the liberty of the workman. This will be discussed separately, in section (f).

(e) *His Views on the Relation of Architecture to Morality, Nature and Religion.*

(i) As for his views regarding *the relation of Art to Morality*, we have seen how Ruskin laid down the rule that 'the character of the artist has more to do with the making of his art than the deftness of his hand; and that a picture is the record of a soul.

"In its moral aspects, Ruskin's principle sounds a commonplace, for it is a rediscovery of the principle of Milton that a true poet must make his life a poem. But nothing is so original as a commonplace which is genuinely believed in. Morever, it was not a commonplace as and when Ruskin uttered it; on the other hand, it was felt to be the enunciation of a new and revolutionary principle." But we have also seen in one of the preceding sections how he drives an undeniable truth too far in weaving aesthetics into a single texture.

(ii) As for *the relation between architecture and religion*, Ruskin identified them and made the architecture of a nation depend on its religious fervour. A reference to the summary of the second lecture will show how Ruskin identifies the Greek, Medieval, Renaissance and Victorian styles of architecture with the religious spirit of those times. Instances could also be given from *The Stones of Venice*. Thus he remarks that the Roman Christian architecture is the exact expression of the Christianity of the time,—very fervid and beautiful but very imperfect; radiant with a strong, childlike imagination which, as the people give themselves up to idolatry, becomes corpse-light. The architecture sinks into a settled form,—a strange, and embalmed repose like that of the religion it expressed.

He goes still further. He establishes a connection between the pulpit and the sermon which is preached from it. He says that the pulpit must be constructed with a view to the ideal function of the sermon as well as to practical convenience. He further says that the church in Venice, an ark of refuge in the midst of the water, exactly expresses the spirit of religious fervour which animated Venice during the days of her greatness.

In examining the raised seals and the episcopal throne in the church, the rudeness of arrangement and the want of all appliances of comfort, he says that there is a dignity which no furniture of stalls ever could attain, "and well worth the contemplation of the Protestant both as sternly significative of an episcopal authority which in the early days of the Church

was never disputed, and as dependant for all its impressiveness on the utter absence of any expression either of pride or of self-indulgence." This shows his growing ability to criticise the Protestant atmosphere in which he was brought up.

In the chapter on St. Mark's, Ruskin notes the effect of the interior. Here his anti-Catholic feeling is clearly revealed. He say that there on the shrines of 'Romanism—a term of reproach for Roman Catholicism—veiled figures always murmur their appointed prayers. The artificial light that is constantly maintained, the inherent darkness and other stage properties of superstition are said to produce a false awe in minds incapable of apprehending the true nature of the deity. "The arts of the Magus and the Brahmins are exhausted in the animation of a paralysed Christianity."

Another chapter on St. Mark's also reveals a defect in his criticism. He discovers a systematic symbolism in the inscriptions on its walls and elsewhere. But this may not at all be historical. Nothing is easier than symbolism run riot. One can discover the same symbolism in the Renascence buildings if one wants to.

In the chapter on Byzantine palaces he identifies colour with religion or thought. He explains that Shem, the ancestor of the Asiatic races, means splendour. Hence the Asiatic mind, being religious, shows a warm love of colour. Establishing the holiness and divinity of colour in this way, he goes to prove that the more faithful and earnest the religion of the painter, the more pure and prevalent is the system of his colour.

In the same context, he says: "I do not wonder at what men suffer but at what they lose. The fruit struck to the earth before its ripeness! Venice became in aftertimes the revel of the earth, the masque of Italy, and *therefore* is she now desolate." This shows he was not so much a critic as a prophet.

In the chapter on *The Nature of Gothic* he pleads for the liberty of the workman and advances the argument that because life itself is essentially imperfect, it is no wonder if art is so.

Here is also seen his ability to criticise Puritanism. Rigidity is a more definitely Gothic quality than any other but the best Gothic building is not that which is the *most* Gothic. We must be cautious lest it may go too far, and like the great Puritan

spirit in its extreme, lose itself either in frivolity of division or perversity of purpose. It did so later. But in its best is expressed in every line the very temper which has been thought to be the most adverse to it,—the Protestant spirit of self-independence and enquiry. The habits of philosophical investigation, domestic independence and self-reliance are seen in its veined foliage, thorny fretwork, and its fearless height of subtle pinnacle and crested tower, sent "like an unperplexed question up to heaven."

Ruskin condemns the 'soullessness' and 'pride' of the science of Renaissance architecture. It was his queer view that the Renaissance was decadent rather than renascent.

He even champions the imperfect carvings of medieval workman because he is sure that they are the products of truly religious souls. They were born out of the fear of Death and Sin. He laments the absence of such art in modern buildings.

It is in the conclusion to this book that we see Ruskin the prophet. He has hitherto explained the merits and demerits of the ages that are past. He now comes to his own age. He takes a broad view of the world as such and is glad to no.e that it is progressing though it is still very imperfect. He wishes that architecture also ought to progress in the same way. The only remedy for it is a revival of Gothic. He says that the very end of art is now misunderstood. He goes on to define Art; "Art is valuable or otherwise only as it expresses the personality, activity and living perception of a good and great human soul." He hails Mr. Hope's church in Margaret Street as the first church of this type. And he concludes with prescribing to the soullessness of his age the only possible remedy,—Religion!

Ruskin's arguments may be wrong. But the sincerity, the greatness and the essential truth of his message cannot be doubted.

(iii) As for *Ruskin's views on the relation of Art to Nature*, we have to admit that it was, in his day at least, of the greatest importance. Art was in those days in the danger of becoming a mere handicraft. Its rules did not alter. Given so many rules, you produced a picture with mathematical certainty. Mediocre pictures were produced in endless progres-

sion, each as like to each as though they had been turned out of a factory. The greatest and most inspired artist of his day, Turner, was the object of ridicule, for he revolted against these pedantic rules. Ruskin recalled men to Nature in art, as Wordsworth did in poetry. He laid down the rule that it was the business of the artist to study Nature with all humility, "rejecting nothing, selecting nothing, scorning nothing."

(*f*) *The Relation between Architecture and Socialism.*

He looked upon Architecture as a great art and was shocked by what he considered to be the decay of that noble art in his own age. This decay he traced to the moral degeneration of the people of his age.

The cultivation of noble art depends on the healthy moral and social life of the community, and to obtain the highest result perfect liberty is to be given to the workman to work on his own initiative. Apart from these basic principles, these are some of his contentions about the technique of art:—

(*a*) That Gothic or Romanesque construction is nobler than Greek construction. (*b*) That ornamentation is the principal part of architecture. (*c*) That ornamentation should be visible. (*d*) That ornamentation should be natural. (*e*) That ornamentation should be thoughtful. (*f*) That, therefore, Gothic ornamentation is nobler than Greek and the only architecture which should now be taken up.

By (*a*) Ruskin means to say that building an arch, vault or dome (Gothic style) is a nobler and more ingenious work than laying a flat stone or beam over the space to be covered (Greek style). By (*b*) he means that ornamentation is the principal part of architecture, considered as a subject of fine art. It must at once follow from this that a great architect must be a great sculptor or painter. A person who is not a sculptor or painter, can only be a *builder*. In (*c*) he prefers the medieval way of decorating the bottoms of buildings with ornaments, as they will be fully visible, to the Greek way of decorating the tops. In (*d*) he lays down his favourite theory that all art should be modelled on Nature. Ornamentation on buildings should in some degree express the beauty of natural objects. "All noble ornament is the expression of man's delight in God's work." In (*e*) he repeats his other deep con-

viction that all art should be an expression of some thought or feeling of the artist, and that a workman should not be reduced to the level of a machine.

(*f*) is the conclusion deduced by Ruskin from this discussion of the previous propositions, and especially of the fifth. His contention is that Gothic ornamentation is nobler than Greek ornamentation, because the former is visible, natural and thoughtful.

It is the acceptance of the fifth principle which he strongly advocated in his discussions on Architecture: the workman must be a thinking, feeling, living and happy human being, and not a mere mechanical tool or lifeless machine.

The architect has much in common with the sculptor and the painter; he creates an *epic in stone* and avails himself of the arts and designs of the others. The question which Ruskin raises in the *Stones of Venice* is controversial. The painter engaged on a landscape would not think of entering into it a number of cows prepared by the others. It is essential that each item should be creative work But a brother painter may paint some detail and then it would be the creation of two minds instead of one. Similarly a brother poet may complete the unfinished work of another. Now, it is laid down by Ruskin that the same kind of originality and individual creation must prevail in every detail of the work of the architect. This is not part of our modern conception of the duties of an architect. He arranges design and pattern, and skilled workmen carry out his instructions. They are not brother creators, as were the poet and painter who helped; they merely supply some mechanically executed work because the architect is not able to do it all for himself. But according to Ruskin, it would not be a satisfactory work of art because of the imitative nature of the labours of the workmen.

Now it will not be denied that Ruskin raised the subject of art to a new dignity by changing its ideals entirely. Hitherto it had been considered as a study distinct from the national life,—art for art's sake. Ruskin "endeavoured from first to last to work ethics and aesthetics into a sort of single texture. But he must needs be bolder still, and actually attempt to ally with Art, if not to subject it to her,— the most utilitarian of all the Political Economy. He developed the subject in the

eccentric book called *Unto this Last*. In this book, Aesthetics and economics combined and took a distinctly Socialist turn."

It will be noted that in appraising the value of the objects of art Ruskin deals rather with the processes which produced such objects than with their own actual merits when completed. If there has been any employment of "unskilled" labour and for mere imitative work, that object of art is at once condemned. His position may be first grasped clearly: he condemns the use of machinery for the production of household furniture and ornament in general. He does not deny that the furniture in question may be excellent, beautiful, useful,—he does not even discuss the fact that the most beautiful furnishings may be copied in the minutest detail by mechanical processes of mass-production. His sole quarrel with Victorian furniture is that it is manufactured in factories, and by machinery which is attended to by workmen who have no part in designing the work. Similarly, he does not deny the fact that some old Gothic sculpture is rough and unskilled in execution, and to be described as fantastic rather than beautiful. Each ugly feature is to Ruskin an added proof of the individual nature of its conception, and this he makes the main requirement.

Now, we may or may not agree with the use of machinery for mass-production of furniture and we may admit that there are many unsound features in factory-life. But there comes a point where opinion may diverge. For it may justly be argued that this has nothing to do with the intrinsic artistic value of the article which has been produced by such means. Art-critics insist that we should apply the sole test of beauty, of harmony of hue and colour. This was certainly the outlook of the times in which Ruskin lived. The creed of Art for Art's sake had arisen, but Ruskin refuted it, bringing in moral and social considerations. His was a broader conception of Art than ever had been contemplated before. Yet Tennyson had evolved it in the *Palace of Art* and declared that the ultimate end of Art was bound up with the pursuit of truth. Ruskin's is the statement of an extreme view. We are at liberty to think differently.

We may also question the validity of Ruskin's other contention,—that noble architecture is the natural outcome of a progressive and healthy community. He is here committing a common mistake—that of looking at the faults of his own age

with the critical eye of a social reformer, and of looking back on the Middle Ages through a rosy mist of romance. While interested in all Gothic architecture and medieval painting, Ruskin is here drawing his particular illustrations from the buildings of Venice. He finds that the great buildings and paintings of the Venetians were produced during a period when Venice was great and flourishing; she was then an independent city with a far-reaching influence on the Mediterranean. So he draws from this fact the conclusion that a great nation produces great works of Art. As he has quarrelled with Victorian thought and ideals, he identifies them with smoky manufacturing towns and busy factories. Now there were many buildings of noble Gothic design produced in England, France and Germany at the very time when Venetian structures were first designed. Yet we do not find that those periods in England and France were marked by real greatness in any department of national life. There was no high stage of freedom or intellectual responsibility then; under the feudal system, men were as slaves.

We are not blaming Ruskin. His superb taste is shown in every line so far as the technique of Art is concerned. It is in the practical conclusions which he applies to social, moral and economic problems, that he goes wrong.

(g) *Conclusion*:

On the whole, Ruskin's telescopic vision is sound. It is his microscopic vision that is often blurred. His fame as a teacher of great principles and as a master of English prose is bound to endure for a long time. He helped to revive in England an appreciation of the various forms of the art and architecture of the past. It is said that, in England, the force of his message in art has been exhausted, as it has been assimilated into practice. It is his Christian socialism that is of importance today in England. But in India we need his art-criticism as well as his teachings in political economy. Possessing as we do, some of the noblest architecture of the world, we cannot afford to ignore his pronouncements on architecture.

(N. B. The information presented in this section is an abstract of the views set forth in some of the books mentioned in the bibliography and the class-notes of Prof. Wodehouse).

11. Ruskin's Views on Religion

We have seen that, from his very early days, Ruskin was a devout reader of the Bible. He quotes frequently from the Bible in support of his economic or moral teaching,—not so much because he thought that these references would strengthen his own case as for the reason that his ideas attracted the relevant sayings from the Bible almost instinctively, since he had pored over the Book so intensely all his life. Harrison points out that 'interspersed (mainly in the first lecture given to workmen) we may find nearly sixty texts of Scripture, inwoven into the argument in Ruskin's figurative way.'

Ruskin distinguished between four classes of Bible readers: (1) Those who regard every *syllable* of it as God's word; (2) Those who regard the *substance* of the Bible as communicated to man by speakers and writers who were divinely inspired. (3) Those who believe that the books of the Bible contain, like other *human* writings, true and false statements and just and erring thoughts. These readers feel, nevertheless, that the Bible narrates the dealings of God with humanity in its early stages and in after-time through Christ and that it bears witness to the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. (4) Finally, those who believe that "whether you regard or do not regard the Bible as a divinely inspired book, it should have at least as much authoritative claim to our faith as the religious writings of the Egyptians, the Greeks, Persians or Indians. For, in common with all these, it contains a portion, divinely appointed, of the best wisdom which the human intellect, earnestly seeking for help from God, has hitherto been able to gather between birth and death".

Ruskin appeals to the Bible in the spirit of the fourth class of readers. "This Book which has been the accepted guide of the moral intelligence of Europe for some fifteen hundred years, enforces certain simple laws of human conduct which you know have also been agreed upon, in every main point, by all the religious, and by all the greatest profane, writers, of every age and country. Let it then not offend you if, deducing principles of action first from the laws and facts of nature, I nevertheless fortify them also by appliance of the precepts, or suggestive and probable teachings, of this Book, of which the authority is over many around you, more distinctly than over

you, and which, confessing to be divine, *they* at least, can only disobey at their moral peril".—

Ruskin grew up in an atmosphere of strict Protestantism. He climbed into a chair and preached when he was not quite three years old. But 'the forms of outward religion were losing their hold over him, in proportion as his inward religion became more real and intense', when he was about forty. He could no longer abide by orthodox religion'. In the *Stones of Venice* Ruskin had displayed his Protestant affiliations by attacking 'Romanism' in many ways. But neither Protestantism nor Catholicism meant anything to him, now that he was a heretic. This struggle between conscience and reason in Ruskin lasted all his life, though he was nearer belief than unbelief in his old age. Ruskin's faith had been shaken by his own work in geology and botany and by the severe mental struggle through which he was passing at this time (1850—63). Bishop Colenso of Natal who published a critical examination of the *Pentateuch* in 1862, was a friend of Ruskin. Ruskin fully accepted his line of argument. There is a reference to the Colenso controversy in *The Crown of Wild Olive* (§ 35). Ruskin became an unbeliever. It was as late as 1845 that Ruskin 'broke the Sabbath' for the first time in his life, 'by climbing a hill after church.' But he now preached to his followers that they should live their lives in full in admiration, hope and love and not......sacrifice themselves in fasting.' He was not sure that there was another life. He only hoped there was.

But Ruskin slowly recovered his faith in another life and in the immortality of the soul, about the year 1876. Evidences of these came to him during that year, especially on Christmas Day, which was a critical day in his life. Collingwood relates an interesting incident in his biography of Ruskin, an incident which shows how Ruskin wrapped up his prophet's robes about him and spoke like Jeremiah. In 1884, "feeling as he did the weight of human wrong against which it was his mission to prophesy, believing in a Divine government of the world in all its literalness, he had the courage to appear before a London audience, like any seer of old, and to tell them that the 'plague-wind' raging then was 'a symbol of the moral darkness' of the nation.' Ruskin's despondency changed into

the happiness of faith after 1876 and he 'returned at last, not to the fold of the Church, but to the footstool of the Father.'

During the period in which the lectures in *The Crown of Wild Olive* were delivered, Ruskin was passing through the sceptical and heretical phase of his middle age. "It is a difficult thing," he had written a few years before, "to live without hope of another world......; but by how much the more difficult, by so much it makes one braver and stronger." Ruskin calls on his readers to have this courage, in a beautiful passage in the Preface. He does not wholly accept the agnostic attiude but pleads that "fate may be bravely met, and conduct wisely ordered on either expectation."

Ruskin reverts to the same theme in his lecture on the Mystery of Life delivered in Dublin in 1869. After reviewing all the mysteries of life, he condemns the indifference of mankind to the purpose of its life as the crowning mystery of all. The call of duty is the same, whether the soul is mortal or immortal. "Think you that judgment waits till the doors of the grave are opened? It waits at the door of your houses—it waits at the corner of your streets; we are in the midst of judgment—the insects that we crush are our judges—the moments we fret away are our judges—the elements that feed us judge, as they minister—and the pleasures that deceive us, judge, as they indulge."

In his lecture on 'Work,' Ruskin makes fun of the 'Churchianity' of people,—their soulless orthodoxy. They sing songs about God and perform 'Divine Service,' but it is nothing. He advises them to cultivate innocence and purity of heart and quotes with approval the words of Christ,—"Suffer little children to come unto me ......for of such is the kingdom of heaven." "You have had false prophets among you," he says in his lecture on 'War' "......false prophets who have told you that all men are nothing but fiends and wolves, half-beast, half-devil. Believe that, and indeed you may sink to that. But refuse that, and have faith that God made you upright......So, you will strive daily to become more what your Maker meant and means you to be......" He condemns ecclesiastical architecture, declares the sacredness of the whole earth and criticises the Victorians for having

separated their religion from their life by adopting the Gothic style of architecture for their churches and schools and another for their mansions and mills. He declares that architecture is good only when it is essentially religious and wants to know whether the citizens of Bradford wish to build their Exchange as Christians or as infidels. As against the worship of the God of Wisdom and Power by the Greeks, of the God of Judgment and Consolation by the Middle Ages and of the God of Pride and Beauty by the Renaissance, Ruskin draws a ghastly picture of the worship of the Goddess of Getting-on by the Victorians. Their warehouses and exchanges are built to this goddess. He tells them that their exchange also must have its heroisms if it is to be built in a good architectural style. Finally, he recommends to them the ideal of an 'honest and simple order of existence,' and the maxim that to do the best for others is finally to do the best for ourselves.

As to how far faith in a future life is necessary for ordering our conduct wisely in our present life is ably discussed in F. W. N. Myers' essay on Marcus Aurelius, the great Roman Emperor. Marcus Aurelius was a Stoic. Higher stoicism "insisted on what may be termed the catholic verities of all philosophers, i. e. on the sole importance of Virtue, on the spiritual oneness of the universe and the brotherhood of men." But this philosophy failed to satisfy Marcus Aurelius. Not that he had no Faith or Love, for his Meditations contain evidences of both ; but he had not the certainty of hope. For, as Myers says: 'Amidst the various creeds and philosophies, by aid of which men have ordered their life on earth, the most persistent and fundamental line of division is surely this :—the question whether that life is to be ordered by rules drawn from its own experience alone, or whether there are indications which may justly modify our conduct or expectations by some influx of inspiration, or some phenomena testifying to the existence of an unseen world, or to our continued life after this body's decay." Stoicism is based on the former and Christianity upon the latter assumption.

An advanced school of moralists, however, maintain—and it is this view to which Ruskin is referring here—that a sure and certain hope of life after death is not even desirable for

virtuous conduct in this life. The practice of Virtue, it is said, must be disinterested. But this is true upto a certain limit. Our conduct can be directed on this principle up to a certain point but our force and energy have to be maintained in the struggle. "It is then that the mortalist must needs welcome any influence, if such there be, which can pour into man's narrow vessel some overflowing of an infinite power. It is then, too, that he will learn to perceive that the promise of a future existence might well be a source of potent stimulus rather than of enervating peace."

In *Praeterita*, —Vol. II § 117, Ruskin has defined Christianity. "The total meaning was, and is, that the God who made earth and its creatures, took at a certain time upon the earth, the flesh and form of man ; in that flesh sustained pain and died the death of the creature He had made ; rose again after death into glorious human life, and when the date of the human race is ended, will return in visible human form, and render to every man according to his work. Christianity is the belief in, and love of, God thus manifested. Anything less than this, the mere acceptance of the sayings of Christ, or assertion of any less than divine power in His Being, may be, for aught I know, enough for virtue, peace and safety ; but they do not make people Christians, or enable them to understand the heart of the simplest believer in the old doctrine."

12. Ruskin as Moralist.

(*His views on Taste, Childhood, Work and Play, Power, Kingship, Womanhood, War, Conduct, Honour and Industry.*)

(1) *Taste*: The student should read the first part of the summary of the second lecture in this connection. The following passage from *Munera Pulveris* is also to the point. Ruskin is defining sensibility : "By sensibility I mean its (the nation's) natural perception of beauty, fitness and rightness ; or, of what is lovely, decent and just : faculties dependent much on race, and the primal signs of fine breeding in man, but cultivable also by education, and necessarily perishing without it. True education has, indeed, no other function than the development of these faculties, and of the relative will. It has

been the great error of modern intelligence to mistake science for education."

(2) *The Glory of Childhood* : The student should read, in this connection, the third section of the summary of the lecture on Work. Right childhood is distinguished by four characteristics,—humility, faith, charity and cheerfulness. Ruskin draws a contrast between men and children. There is death in the counsels of men, in the looks of men, in the steps of men, in the thoughts of men, and finally, in the principalities and powers of men. In each case a Biblical text is given to show that men are deadly ; and another Biblical text to show that children cannot be harmed by the danger.

The thought of men's powers and principalities leads him on to refer to bloody wars. Though there may be droughts and famines, wars will not cease. Men's weapons and fortifications will not establish peace. The strength 'that will still the enemy', will come out of the mouths of babes and sucklings. 'Suffer little children to come unto me... .....for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' Man must, therefore, cultivate child-like innocence and purity of heart.

(3). *Work and Play* : (*Cf. the second section of the lecture on Work*).

"*The importance of individual character*, the value of work in forming it, the supremacy of duty in directing it : these are some of the leading moral lessons which Mr. Ruskin, like Carlyle, has had to teach."

It used to be thought that the "Condition of England Question" would be solved by the ballot-box, by fresh liberties, by new laws. Not so, said Carlyle. Not so, says Mr. Ruskin. "In life, as in Art, the only liberty worth having is founded on *personal discipline*. This is why Mr. Ruskin lays so much stress on the dignity and usefulness of manual labour."

"All knowledge unaccompanied by a habit of useful action is too likely to become deceitful, and every habit of useful action must resolve itself into some elementary practice of *manual labour*."

"That *every man must work out his own salvation* is the first article of all moral gospels ; but it requires to be immedia-

tely corrected by a second one,—that each man is his brother's keeper." (E. T. Cook).

(4) *Power.* 'War for Dominion' leads Ruskin to consider where 'dominion' or power lies. It lies in command over *men* and not in wealth or territory. That the real wealth of a country consists in its human beings, (C f. the summary of the lecture on War, Section II, b. 2.) and not in money, is part of Ruskin's economic doctrine.

Here also he expounds his idea of 'kingship.' A real king does not govern for his own profit but for the welfare of the governed. In this connection read his appeal to the merchants in the lecture on Traffic § 80 to be the 'captains' of their labourers. Real kingdoms are established by royal labourers governing loyal labourers. Ruskin regretted that in England political power should have gone into the hands of 'merchants.' A nation is healthy only so long as its landed aristocracy is also its soldier class. The soldiers should be governors and governors soldiers (and not mere talkers). This also goes to the root of the economic teachings of Ruskin—the division of society into the idle rich and the industrious poor and the fatal employment of the latter for the self-aggrandizement of the former.

(5) *Kingship.*

He tells us in *Praeterita* (vol. I. § 3) that he had formed his idea of kingship ever since the days of his early reading of Homer and Scott. The kings in Homer and Scott do harder work and are paid less for their work. "Of late it has seemed to me that the idea of a king has become exactly opposite to this, and that it has been supposed the duty of superior persons generally to govern less, and get more, than anybody else."

The whole object of Ruskin's lecture on 'King's Treasuries' in *Sesame and Lilies*, is to give us a true definition of kingship. "Mighty of heart, mighty of mind"—to be this, is indeed to be great in life ; to become this increasingly is to 'advance' in life. He only is advancing in life whose heart is getting softer, whose blood warmer, whose brain quicker, whose spirit is entering into living peace. And the men who have this life are the true lords or kings of the earth, they, and they only. All other kingships are only so in appearance:

You should measure the dominion of a real king not by its geographical boundaries, but by the multitude of men over whom he has influence. Indeed this power cannot be measured. The treasures of ordinary kings can be measured; there have been three kinds of kings that have gathered such treasures. The Moth-kings lay up treasures for the moth; the Rust-kings lay up treasures for the rust; and the Robber-kings lay up treasures for the robbers! Broidered robe, only to be rent; helm and sword only to be dimmed; jewel and gold only to be scattered.

But suppose there was a fourth order of kings with a fourth kind of treasure! A web, made fair in the weaving, by Athena's shuttle; an armour, forged in divine fire by Vulcanian force; a gold, to be mined in the very sun's red heart where he sets over the Delphian cliffs:—deep-pictured tissue;—impenetrable armour;—potable gold;—the three great Angels of Conduct, Toil, and Thought—suppose this fourth order of kings was to bring forth treasures of Wisdom!

§ 42—§ 45 *Sesame and Lilies.*

He returns to the same subject in his second lecture. Both well-directed moral training and well-chosen reading lead to the possession of a power over the ill-guided and the illiterate, which is according to the measure of it, in the truest sense, kingly; conferring indeed the purest kingship that can exist among men; other kingships (however distinguised by visible insignia or material power) are only shadows of royalty. Only one kind of kingship is inevitable and eternal; kingship which consists in a stronger moral state, and a truer thoughtful state, than that of others; enabling you, therefore, to guide, or to raise them. § 51—§ 52 *Lilies.*

(6) *Womanhood.*

The influence of woman upon man is also the subject of Ruskin's lecture on 'Queen's Gardens' in *Sesame and Lilies.* It is an amplification of what is contained in the four sections of the lecture on War,—paragraphs 97, 128—31.

In all Christian ages which have been remarkable for their purity of progress, there has been an absolute yielding of obedient devotion, by the lover to his mistress. Chivalry assumes, in its very first conception of honourable life, the

subjection of the young knight to the command—should it even be the command in caprice—of his lady. It assumes this, because its masters knew that the first and necessary impulse of every truly taught and knightly heart is this of blind service to its lady; that where that true faith and capacity are not, all wayward and wicked passion must be; and that in this rapturous obedience to the single love of his youth, is the sanctification of all man's strength, and the continuance of all his purposes. And this, not because such obedience would be safe, or honourable, were it ever rendered to the unworthy; but because it ought to be impossible for every noble youth—it is impossssible for every one rightly trained—to love any one whose gentle counsel he cannot trust, or whose prayerful command he can hesitate to obey.

The buckling on of the knight's armour by his lady's hand is the type of an eternal truth—that the soul's armour is never well set to the heart unless a woman's hand has braced it; and it is only when she braces it loosely that the honour of manhood fails.

What is thus true of the relation between the lover and his beloved is more than true of the relations between husband and wife. The wife, in her home, is protected from all the struggle and hardship of life. Thus the true nature of home is that it is not home. But wherever a true wife is found, this home is always around her. A woman ought to be properly educated to become the Queen of such a home. Her education should be such as will confirm her natural instincts for justice, and refine her natural tact of love. A woman, thus educated, becomes not only the Lady of her household dominion, but the Queen of a dominion far extending beyond her home. This queenship, women cannot avoid. "Whether consciously or not, you must be, in many a heart enthroned: there is no putting by that crown; queens you must always be; queens to your lovers; queens to your husbands and your sons; queens of higher mystery to the world beyond, which bows itself, and will ever bow before the myrtle crown, and the stainless sceptre of womanhood.

Should women neglect or fail to exercise this power over men, every sort of misrule and violence will set in. "There is not a war in the world, no, nor an injustice, but you women are

answerable for it; not in that you have provoked, but in that you have not hindered. Men by their nature are prone to fight; they will fight for any cause, or for none. It is for you to choose their cause for them, and to forbid them when there is no cause. There is no suffering, no injustice, no misery on the earth, but the guilt of it lies with you. Men can bear the sight of it, but you should not be able to bear it. Men may tread it down without sympathy in their own struggle; but men are feeble in sympathy and contracted in hope; it is you only who can feel the depths of pain, and conceive the way of its healing. Instead of trying to do this, you turn away from it; you shut yourselves within your park-walls and garden-gates and you are content to know that there is beyond them a whole world in wilderness—a world of secrets which you dare not penetrate; and of suffering which you dare not conceive.

§ 66—§ 91 *Queen's Gardens.*

') *War.*

Mrs. Meynell, who has done so much to present the teachings of Ruskin in a connected form, complains that there is a string of paradoxes in his lecture on War. Ruskin himself was conscious of this inconsistency and he defends himself elsewhere in these words (*Notes on the Political Economy of Prussia*). "I am often accused of inconsistency: but I believe myself defensible against the charge with respect to what I have said on nearly every subject except that of War. It is impossible for me to write consistently of war, for the group of facts I have gathered about it lead me to two precisely opposite conclusions."

"When I find this the case, in other matters, I am silent till I can choose my conclusion: but, with respect to war, I am forced to speak, by the necessities of time; and forced to act, one way or another. The conviction on which I act is, that it causes an incalculable amount of avoidable human suffering, and that it ought to cease among Christian nations; and if, therefore, any of my boy-friends desire to be soldiers, I try my utmost to bring them into what I conceive to be a better mind. But, on the other hand, I know for certain that the most beautiful characters yet developed among men have been formed in war; that all great nations have been warrior nations, and that the only kinds of peace which we are likely to get in the present age are ruinous alike to the intellect and the heart."

The object of Ruskin's lecture on war was thus to strengthen the trust of the young soldiers, to whom it was addressed, in their profession. The note of inconsistency is struck when, in appealing to women to try and influence men to put an end to all wars, he exalts peace.

"How far, in the future, it may be possible for me to gain the kingship without either fronting death, or inflicting it, seems to me not at present determinable. The historical facts are that, broadly speaking, none but soldiers, or persons with a soldierly faculty, have ever yet shown themselves fit to be kings; and that no other men are so gentle, so just and so clear-sighted. Wordsworth's *Character of the Happy Warrior* (See Wordsworth's poem.) cannot be reached in the height of it *but* by a warrior; nay, so much is it beyond common strength that I had supposed the entire meaning of it to be metaphorical, until one of the best soldiers in England (the late Sir Herbert Edwards) himself read me the poem, and taught me, what I might have known, had I enough watched his own life, that it was entirely literal."

(8) *Conduct, Honour and Industry*: (a) The last two passages in the preface interpret the philosophical implications of the Crown of Wild Olive,—type of grey honour and sweet rest. Whether we believe in a future life or no, 'Fate may be met bravely, and conduct ordered wisely on either expectation. (b) Rough men have to do rough work and noble men, noble work. But all work must be done, not in a disorderly or scrambling way, but in an ordered, soldierly, human way. All wise work is honest, useful and cheerful. Those who do manual labour should also be regarded as gentlemen and they should have their appointed times of rest and wholesome play. The capitalists should not be an exploiting class but good captains and lieutenants of labour. They should also do their commerce for fixed salaries. There is a wide difference between being captains and governors of work and taking the profits of it. They should give up worshipping Mammon. They should determine some honest and simple order of existence.' You will build with stone well but with flesh better; temples not made with hands, but riveted of hearts.' (c) Idleness is the worst kind of vice. It is associated with that peace which allows the vices of civil life

to flourish. Ruskin advises the young soldiers not to be thoughtless in their days of youth. All the duties of her children to England may be summed in two words,—industry and honour.' They should avoid betting. 'Were there no other ground for industry, this would be a sufficient one; that it protected you from the temptation to so scandalous a vice'. (d) 'Every virtue of the higher phases of manly character begins in this;—...in truth and pity, or truth and reverence, to all womanhood.' Ruskin addresses the ladies thus: 'The whole course and character of your lovers' lives is in your hands......a true wife, in her husband's house, is his servant; it is in his heart that she is queen.' (e) The issues raised between country and country may have to be determined by the truth of the sword, the equity of the rifle. But you should not "put your quarrel into the hearts of your poor, and sign your treaties with peasant's blood". Modern war, or scientific, chemical and mechanic war, is 'worse even than the savage's poisoned arrow'. The Spartans won the decisive battle of Corinth with the loss of eight men; the victors at indecisive Gettysburg confess to the loss of 30,000. Thus the game of war should be regarded as only that in which the full personal power of the human creature is brought out in the management of its weapons. (f) We must have the fixed conviction that human nature is essentially a noble and beautiful thing, though it may be capable of infinite height and infinite fall. (g) No government is ultimately strong, but in proportion to its kindness and justice. (h) The soldiers of England should not become merely the 'police of her manufacturing towns, and the beadles of her little Bethels'. (i) Ruskin attacks the European vice of Jealousy "which brings competition into your commerce, treachery into your councils, and dishonour into your wars—that vice which has rendered for you, and for your next neigbouring nation, the daily occupations of existence no longer possible, but with the mail upon your breasts and the sword loose in its sheath." (j) Good architecture is essentially religious—the production of a faithful and virtuous, not of an infidel and corrupted people. (k) It is a wonder that heroism has never been supposed to be in anywise consistent with the practice of supplying people with food, or clothes; but rather with that of quartering oneself upon them for food, and stripping

them of their clothes. (1) Ruskin attacks the British worship of the Goddess of Getting-on and gives an ironic picture of the Englisman's ideal of life,—a beautiful mansion on each pleasant bank of this world with a mill at the bottom of the bank employing nearly a thousand workers.

13. Ruskin as Political Economist.

(*a*) *Ruskin's Revolt against the Orthodox Economists of his Day.*

The Industrial Revolution that was responsible for the rise of the Manchester School of Political Economy has been dealt with in 2 (b) of this introduction. Ruskin's critictsm of the theories of this school has also been set forth in that section in some detail. It now remains to state Ruskin's criticism in his own terms as he offered it in his classical work on the subject, *Unto this Last.*

Modern economists believe that an advantageous code of social action may be determined irrespectively of the influence of social affections. This is a delusion. It is an ossifiant theory of progoess founded on the negation of a soul.

The first vital problem which economists have to deal with the relation between the employer and the employed, shows that this theory is a delusion. The strike in the building trade in 1859 baffled all the economists. They could give no demonstrable solution.

No human actions were ever intended by the maker of men to be guided by balances of expediency, but by balances of justice.

Thus the economic principles, taught ordinarily today to the multitudes, lead straight to national destruction. This can be illustrated by referring to two problems: (a) the relations between the employer and the employed; (b) the merchant's place in society.

If the economist maintains that his science is simply the science of getting rich, his is mercantile and not political economy. Political economy or the economy of a state consists simply in the production, preservation and distribution at fittest time and place, of useful or pleasurable things. It adds continually to the riches and well-being of the nation. But *mercantile economy* or the economy of 'mav' implies as much

poverty on one side as riches on the other. In fact, the final outcome of all wealth is in the producing of as many happy human creatures as possible.

Treasures of wickedness profit nothing. But justice delivers from death, says the Bible. The meeting of the rich and the poor may be either just or destructive. The mistake of the best men through the ages has been that great one of thinking to help the poor by alms-giving and by preaching of patience or of hope, rather than by justice.

The popular economist thinks that, where demand is, supply must follow. But the disposition and administration of this course of demand and supply can be altered by human forethought. We can guide, if not withstand the flow and make the water of marsh the water of life.

There are many sciences, as well as arts, of getting rich—poisoning, adulteration of food, blackmail, obtaining goods on credit, pocket-picking etc. Mercantile economy may be the science of getting rich by *legal* means. But legal means are by no means always just. But if the need for justice is granted, economics will no longer depend merely on prudence, but on jurisprudence, on divine, and not human law. *We should love justice by preference to all things else.*

We want both the kinds of justice—(a) that of the King, guiding or ruling all, which is the stronger and active justice. All true royalty is ruling power, just as all true saintliness is saving power; (b) the justice or equity of the judge discerning between opposites,—the justice of choice which is the feebler and passive justice. The word 'Righteousness' properly refers to the justice of rule.

Absolute justice is indeed no more attainable than absolute truth. But as much justice as we all need for practical use is attainable by all those who make it their aim. The payment of just wages alone will lead to the happiness of the poor.

The Bible denounces money as the root of all evil. Yet we are thinking of 'a science of becoming rich' as the shortest road to national prosperity! The true science is that which teaches nations to desire and labour for the things that lead to life and to shun the opposite. It is a science of the distribution of the right thing to the right man.

(*b*) *Ruskin's Economic Theories*:—

C. S. Devas, a distinguished writer on economics, has summed up the most significant of Ruskin's views on the subject as follows:

(a) That a right theory of consumption is of primary importance in economics, and no estimate of wealth is reasonable which does not regard the quality of the product and the use to which it is put.

(b) That, therefore, we must understand the nature not only of positive, but also of negative wealth; and not only of well-directed but also of ill-directed production and consumption.

(c) That, as a consequence, economic science is bound up with ethics.

The following is also an excellent exposition by E. T. Cook of Ruskin's position as an economist:—

"Mr. Ruskin has done great service by insisting that (1) political economy can furnish sound laws of national life and work only when it respects the dignity and moral destiny of man; (2) that the wide use of wealth, in developing a complete human life, is of incomparably greater moment, both to men and nations, than its production or accumulation, and can alone give these any vital significance; (3) that honourable performance of duty is more truly just than rigid enforcement of right; and that not in competition but in helpfulness, not in self-assertion but in reverence, is to be found the power of life. I take this enumeration of Ruskin's economic principles from the address presented to him in 1885, by a large body of his admirers, including most of the literary and artistic celebrities of the day."

"How under existing conditions is the wealth of England in this sense to be advanced? In three ways principally. First, by the adoption in politics of the great principle of "property to whom proper"—of land and tools to those who can use them. Secondly, by planting firmly on English land (including the colonies) as many men and women as it will support; by the recognition of "soldiers of the ploughshare as well as soldiers of the sword;" and generally by the substitution of the rest of satisfaction for the unrest of ambition.

"The most helpful and sacred work which can at present be done for humanity," says Mr. Ruskin, "is to teach people, not how to better themselves, but how to satisfy themselves." Follow out these two ideas of co operation instead of competition, of living instead of getting, and you will see how Mr. Ruskin's economics would release the pressure upon poverty. So much for the acquisition of wealth. With regard to its distribution he is no equalizer. He teaches not the wickedness of riches, but their use. Then, thirdly and lastly, the National Wealth is to be prompted by the wise direction of expenditure. Happiness is only to be got out of honesty, food only out of the ground. These are two of his leading principles in economics; but the third is that money is essentially not a medium of exchange, but a token of right. And it makes all the difference in the world whether you use your right to grow "grapes or grapeshot,' and whether when you have got them you use them to preserve life or to destroy it. And that being so, just as "that country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy beings," so that man is the richest "who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest and most helpful influence, both personal and by means of his possessions, over the lives of others." In such a conception of national economy it is easy to see the large sphere that Art must play—Art that dignifies industry and adorns daily life. "The treasures of true kings," says Mr. Ruskin, in "*Sesame and Lilies*" "are the streets of their cities; and the gold they gather, which for others is as the mire of the streets, changes itself for them and their people into a crystalline pavement for evermore."

(c) *Ruskin's Definition of Wealth.*

If not the accumulation of money, what, then, is the true object of Political Economy? Ruskin answers this question by giving us precise definitions of 'Value' and 'Wealth'. He called what was popularly known as political economy 'a bastard' political economy. Real political economy has to do with "the support of the population of a country in healthy and happy life, and the increase of their numbers, so far as that increase is consistent with their happiness." §3 *M. Pul.*

It is not the object of Political Economy merely to accumulate money or exchangeable property—for all this accumulated

money must be spent one day and the great question is how to spend it.

The material things which it is the object of Political Economy to produce and use are things which serve either to sustain and comfort the body, or exercise rightly the affections and form the intelligence. Whatever truly serves either of these purposes is 'useful' to man, wholesome, healthful, helpful, holy. By seeking such things man prolongs and increases his life upon earth.

On the other hand whatever does not serve either of these purposes is, in like manner, useless to man, unwholesome, unhelpful, unholy, and by seeking such things man shortens and diminishes his life upon earth.

Further, whether a thing is useful or useless to man depends upon its intrinsic nature, and man's estimate of the thing does not alter its nature. Bread will sustain him but not stones. All labour directed to the production of useless things is lost for ever. No commercial arrangement of any kind, no theory of exchange or commerce will turn a useless thing into a useful thing.

We may thus define wealth as 'consisting of things essentially valuable'; value signifies the strength or 'availing of anything towards the sustaining of life' and is always twofold—intrinsic and effectual. 'Intrinsic value is the absolute power of anything to support life e. g. of a sheaf of wheat to sustain the substance of body, of a cubic foot of air, to sustain its warmth, and of a cluster of flowers to enliven and animate the senses and the heart."

According to Ruskin, the final object of economics is to use everything and to use it nobly. Mill is mistaken in saying that a demand for commodities is not a demand for labour. It *is* a demand for labour, though in an indirect manner. The real question is about the end towards which this labour is directed. Thus it is better to grow grapes than to grow grapeshots. We reap what we sow. The question for every nation is not how much labour it employs but how much life it produces; for life is the end and aim of consumption, just as consumption is the end and aim of production.

Thus there is no wealth but life. That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy

human beings; that man is the richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life, has also the widest helpful influence over the lives of others.

To give a logical definition of wealth in plain English for the first time was the main object of his *Unto This Last.* This had been done in Greek by Plato and Xenophon and in Latin by Cicero and Horace.

The establishment of inequality is neither bad nor good in itself for the body of the nation. It depends on the methods by which this inequality is accomplished and the purposes to which it is applied. Justly established and nobly used, these inequalities of wealth benefit the nations. In every well-governed nation, the various strength of individuals issues in unequal yet harmonious results, receiving reward or authority according to its class and service. In an ill-governed nation, these inequalities produce the iniquitous dominances and depressions of guilt and misfortune, as opposed to the melodious inequalities of concurrent power.

All morbid local action of riches, like the diseased local determination of the blood, will ultimately involve a weakening of the resources of the nation. It is clear that the establishment of the mercantile wealth which consists in a claim upon labour, signifies a political diminution of the real wealth which consists in substantial possessions.

Thus the real value of riches depends upon the moral value attached to it. Any given quantity of wealth may be indicative of faithful energies or of merciless tyranny. Some treasures may be only the gilded index of far-reaching ruin, the silver pieces of Judas. Some gold, justly earned, might be brighter in sunshine than in substance. The commercial text, "Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest" represents national disaster and not national economy in the long run.

Power over men is also attainable by other means than money. Many joys may be given to men which cannot be bought for gold; as by affection and kindness. Political economists should take this also into account. It helps to promote the wealth of the nation. Want of affection and ill-treatment result in the misery and the consequent revolt of the

poor classes. This means that wealth will fail in its essence, in its power over men.

Thus the persons themselves are the wealth. The final outcome of all wealth is in the producing of as many as possible happy human creatures or souls of a good quality. Every nation must be able to say of its people : "These are my jewels."

Many of the persons usually considered wealthy, operate for the nation either as pools of dead water or eddies in a stream.

The material value is apt to undermine the manly character ; and the manly character, on its side, is apt to ignore or cast away the material value. The right kind of wealth is used when the manly character progresses by it, without being tempted by it.

In order that the intrinsic value of a thing may be effectual, a certain state of mind is necessary in the recipient of it.

The digesting, breathing, and perceiving functions must be perfect in the human creature before the food, air, or flowers can give their full value to it. The production of effectual value, therefore, always involves two needs : first the production of a capacity to use it. When the intrinsic value and acceptant capacity come together, there is effectual value or wealth. A horse is no wealth to us if we cannot ride, nor a picture if we cannot see; nor can any noble thing be wealth, except to a noble person. M. Pulveris § 1-§ 15.

This emphasizes the essentially moral aspect of wealth and, as Prof. Hobson points out, links up Ruskin's theory of education with the main body of his economic doctrines. For education is to be directed primarily and consciously to making people capable of enjoyment that is noble. This alone makes them capable of wealth. Base persons or a debased community are "inherently and eternally incapable of wealth." And there is also a third factor which determines the human significance of wealth—namely the quantity which each has got. In fact we must know three things about a given quantity of economic goods before we can ascertain their full value to mankind.

(1) What wholesome human service are they capable of rendering? (*i.e.* their intrinsic value).

(2) What kinds of persons will get them? (the acceptant capacity).

(3) How much will each person get? (their distribution).

(*d*) ***Ruskin's Views on the Distribution of Wealth.***

Ruskin is never tired of insisting on the social significance of wealth. To him a quantity of wealth is meaningless unless it is considered in ralation to its mode of acquisition and of spending. As he says, in a fine passage in *Unto This Last*,

"The whole question, therefore, respecting not only the advantage, but even the quanity, of national wealth, resolves itself finally into one of abstract justice. It is impossible to conclude, of any given mass of acquired wealth, merely by the fact of its existence, whether it signifies good or evil to the nation in the midst of which it exists. Its real value depends on the moral sign attached to it, just as sternly as that of a mathematical quantity depends on the algebraical sign attached to it. Any given accumulation of commercial wealth may be indicative, on the one hand, of faithful industries, progressive energies, and productive ingenuities; or, on the other, it may be indicative of mortal luxury, merciless tyranny, ruinous chicane. Some treasures are heavy with human tears, as an ill-stored harvest with untimely rain, and some gold is brighter in sunshine than it is in substance."

"And, therefore, no directions can be given for the gaining of wealth, irrespective of the considerations of its moral sources. The commercial text, "Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest" is no principle of national economy. Buy in the cheapest market?—yes; but what made your market cheap? Charcoal may be cheap among your roof timbers after a fire, and bricks may be cheap in your streets after an earthqurke, but fire and earthquake may not therefore be national benefits. Sell in the dearest? yes, truly. But what made your market dear? You sold your bread today: was it to a dying man who gave his last coin for it, and will never need bread any more; or to a rich man who tomorrow will buy your farm over your head; or to a soldier on his way to pillage the bank in which you have put your fortune?"

The orthodox economists said that the main function of capital consisted only in giving employment. But they did not state what kind of employment it should be. This fallacy arose

because they failed to understand the real nature of wealth. They confounded it with gold or any article that had an exchange value. Ruskin defined wealth as consisting in essentially useful and life-giving things. He then pleaded for labour being employed in the production of such things: "It is, therefore, the manner and issue of consumption which are the real tests of production." "Production does not consist in things laboriously made, but in things serviceably consumable; and the question for the nation is not how much labour it employs, but how much life it produces." (*Unto This Last*).

The whole question of the unjust use of capital has been examined by Ruskin in the sixth chapter of *Munera Pulveris:*

As soon as inequality of wealth arises (and this is just so far as it is the result of the industry and prudence of the rich, and the idleness and improvidence of the poor) the rich get a power over the poor. The rich are now able to direct the labour of the poor and to profit by it. Herein lies the power of capital. The larger the capital the vaster is the mass of labour that he is able to direct, and the greater his profit.

The unfortunate and imprudent poor are thus completely under the control of the rich. The question then of how the poor will be employed by the rich assumes great importance. With regard to this, three things should be considered: § 152—"It is not enough to give him employment. You must employ him first to produce useful things. Secondly, of the several (suppose equally useful) things he can equally well produce, you must set him to make that which will cause him to lead the healthiest life; and lastly, of the thing produced, how much you should take for yourself, and how much you should leave to the others."

Ruskin, on his own part, literally acted up to his maxim of dying poor. In one of his letters (LXXVI, *Fors Clavigera* Vol. IV) he gives us details of how he spent the very considerable forture he had inherited from his parents,—about £160,000,—with lands and houses. It was spent in the purchase of pictures, in gifts to dependent relatives and in various philanthropic projects.

During the last thirty years of his life he was living upon the proceeds of the sale of his own books. He assures his readers:

"My spending, whether foolish or wise, has not been the wanton lavishness of a man who could not restrain his desires, but the deliberate distribution, as I thought best, of the wealth I had received as a trust, while I yet lived, and had power over it."

—In another place (§ 153 *Munera Pulveris,*) Ruskin has remarked that it is better for a rich man that he should spend all the wealth he has acquired upon well-directed enjoyment rather than leave it to others. One should also severely limit the amount of money one proposes to acquire. "But the law or life is, that a man should fix the sum he desires to make annually, as the food he desires to eat daily; and stay when he has reached the limit, refusing increase of business, and leaving it to others, so obtaining due freedom of time for better thoughts".

Ruskin has thus referred to the danger of accumulating wealth. "For, as accumulation cannot go on for ever, but must some day end in its reverse—if this reverse were indeed a beneficial distribution and use, as irrigation from reservoir, the fever of gathering, though perilous to the gatherer, might be serviceable to the community. But it constantly happens, that what is unreasonably gathered is also unreasonably spent by the persons into whose hand it finally falls. Very frequently it is spent in wars, or else in stupefying luxury, twice hurtful, both in being indulged by the rich and witnessed by the poor." § 86 *Munera Pulveris.*

Read the preface to *Munera Pulveris* § 19 where also he traces all modern wars to the greed of the capitalists for interest. This was one of Ruskin's favourite tenets. Compare his statement in § 30, *Sesame and Lilies*:—

A great nation mocks heaven and its powers, "by pretending belief in a revelation which asserts the love of money to be the root of all evil, and declaring, at the same time, that it is actuated, and intends to be actuated in all chief national deeds and measures, by no other love".

There are many passages in the text in which Ruskin shows his contempt for the foreign policy of England (1850-1860) which actuated her to help the strong against the weak. Cf. Lecture on War.

Ruskin also insisted that the upper classes should

do some manual work. In every Society hard work—foul work—has got to be done by *some* body. The employment of slaves for this purpose, though it rendered possible Athenian civilization, is out of the question now. If then slavery is done away with, mechanical and foul employment must take the aspect either of punishment or probation. Criminals should be put to the most dangerous and painful form of work. But of merely rough (not mechanical) manual labour, especially agricultural, a large portion should be done by the upper classes; bodily health and sufficient contrast and repose for the mental functions, being unattinable without it.

§ 109 *Munera Pulveris.*

Ruskin's doctrine of 'social justice' is equally important. It goes to the very root of his economic teachings. He regarded the existing social order as fundamentally unjust, as it was based not upon 'Justice' but upon 'Force or Competition'. No amount of philanthropic effort or labour-legislation could cure the social evils of the time unless and until the whole structure of society was raised upon the foundation of 'Justice'. This is also the central point in the teaching of the socialists.

"A grave responsibility attaches to the manner of spending the smallest sum of money. The object we ourselves covet may, indeed, be desirable and harmless, so far as we are concerned, but the providing us with it may, perhaps, be a very prejudicial occupation to some one else. And then it becomes instantly a moral question, whether we are to indulge in it ourselves or not. Whatever we wish to buy, we ought first to consider not only if the thing be fit for us, but if the manufacture of it be a wholesome and happy one, to allow the consideration of the *effect* of our purchase to regulate the *kind* of our purchase." (§ 41, *Lectures on Architecture and Painting.*)

One of the essential teachings of Ruskin is that masters and men should live and work under identical conditions. The soldier, the physician, the preacher and the artist never escape from work but live and die in it. But the chief object of the capitalist is to set others to work and live upon their labour. Hence the fatal distinction between the idle rich and the industrious poor. This is the most regrettable feature of 'manufacture' or 'capitalism'. "The main British modern idea

is that the master and his men should belong to two entirely different classes; perhaps loyally related to and assisting each other; but yet the one, on the whole, living in hardship—the other in ease; the one uncomfortable—the other in comfort; the one supported in its dishonourable condition by the hope of labouring through it to the higher one,—the other honourably distinguished by their success, and rejoicing in their escape from a life which must nevertheless be led by a thousand to one."

Next to the Holy Bible, the writings that had the greatest influence upon Ruskin were those of Plato and Carlyle. His debt to Plato has been well brought out in an essay by Dean Inge (in the centenary volume). Both Plato and Ruskin were equally firm in deploring the degradation of human character which results from an inordinate fondness for wealth. Thus Plato preferred a self-sufficient 'city state' with its simple agricultural economy to imperial Athens that depended upon the corn supplies from the Propontus, because this external trade brought in its wake, wealth and luxury For the same reason, Ruskin hated the prosperity of England based upon the Industrial Revolution. In the pictures of ideal states or Utopias which Plato and Ruskin drew, both, therefore, took the precaution of strictly limiting the size and population of the state, for growth in population or enlargement of territory leads to 'traffic' and 'luxury and 'war'.

As Ruskin says in Letter XC of *Fors Clavigera* "The first principle of my political economy will be found again and again reiterated that the material wealth of any country is the portion of its possessions which feeds and educates good men and women in it; the connected principle of national policy being that the strength and power of a country depends absolutely on the quantity of good men and women in the territory of it, and not at all on the extent of the territory—still less on the number of vile or stupid inhabitants." In fact, the wealth of a country is in its good men and women as stated in the chapter on the "Veins of Wealth" in *Unto This Last*.

(*e*) *His Views on Industrialism in General.*

Ruskin's main complaint against the Industrial Revolution was that it multiplied useless work in order to put money into the capitalist's purse. He brings this point vividly home in

his criticism of the iron-railings of a Croydon public-house. In his description of the manufacture of iron fencings in Letter LII of *Fors*, he exposes the utter ugliness of it all: "For observe the method and circumstance of their manufacture. You dig a pit for ironstone, and heap a mass of refuse on fruitful land, you blacken your God given sky, and consume your God given fuel to melt the iron; you bind your labourer to the Egyptian toil of its castings and forgings; then, to refine his mind, you send him to study Raphael at Kensington; and with all this cost, filth, time and misery, you at last produce........." (iron-fencings!)

Ruskin's abhorrence of modern city life also finds expression in many places in his writings. He hated railways as much as he hated the cities. He believed that people would be happy if they went back to agriculture and simple handicrafts. He regarded machinery, the use of motive-power and the resulting concentration of population in large towns as interconnected evils. In his lecture on 'Work', Ruskin speaks of the "great foul city of London there,—rattling, growling, smoking, stinking,—a ghastly heap of fermenting brickwork, pouring out poison at every pore...... It is only Lord's cricket ground without the turf: a huge billiard-table without the cloth, and with pockets as deep as the bottomless pit." This, says Harrison, is a specimen of furious exaggeration; for London is 'one of the most historic, one of the most varied, and quite the most healthy city in the Old or the New World'. But are we so sure that London does not deserve Ruskin's criticism? At the same time, it is true that Ruskin over-estimated the possibilities of agriculture, particularly in a country like England, and under-estimated the very important part that large cities play in the growth of civilization. The urban population is, in spite of obvious drawbacks, much more progressive than the rural population.

Nevertheless, Ruskin contrasts the extensive tracts set aside for the preservation of game with the over-crowding in cities. He attacks the rich people who are found of hunting and shooting and have kept to themselves extensive portions of the country with the result that the poor people, driven from their land, have been obliged to flock to the great cities where they live in slums. 'Play', in the black country of Birmingham, means being laid up by sickness. That is the only 'play' that

the workers know! Ruskin quotes the tragedy of the keeper of a blast furnace near Wolverhampton and of the bone-picker in Shadwell and refers to the paupers who sucked the marrow from the bones of horses, to prove how the rich are exploiting the majority of the people. And he asks the pertinent question: 'Why should'nt that little crossing-sweeper have a feather on its head as well as your own child?' He wants the workers to be paid justly and to be treated and educated as gentlemen are. He condemns the British worship of the 'Goddess of Getting-on,' who is only the Goddess of somebody's getting-on and not everybody's. He warns the capitalist class that the Iudustrial Age also is not bound to last for ever but will change and disappear in its own time. 'Shall the Parthenon be in ruins on its rock, and Bolton priory in its meadow, but these mills of yours be the cousummation of the buildings of the earth, and their wheels be as the wheels of eternity?"

Ruskin could also see through the horrors of modern scientific war occasioned by Industrialism. The governors, who fall out, do not shoot one another but make millions of soldiers shoot each other. And who are these governors? Shopkeepers and merchants! They sacrifice the best blood in the country in order to carry on their exploitation uninterruptedly. Soldiers are not true soldiers if they only mean to stand at a shop-door, to protect shop-boys who are cheating inside.

Finally, Ruskin condemns all war for dominion which is the besetting sin of the Age of Science. "A nation need not boast itself of multiplying on its own ground, if it multiplies only as flies or locusts do, with the god of flies for its god......It does not strengthen itself by seizing dominion over races whom it cannot benefit Austria is not strengthened, but weakened, by her grasp of Lombardy; and whatever apparent increase might have accrued to us from the possession of India, whether these prove to us ultimately power or weakness, depends wholly on the degree in which our influence on the native race shall be benevolent and exalting."

As an immediate solution to the problems of industrialism which had affected the workmen adversely, Ruskin made the following concrete suggestions and put a constructive programme before the country, in his four essays in *Unto this Last* and the preface.

(1) There should be training schools over the whole country for youth, established at government cost.

(2) Factories and workshops for the production and sale of every necessity of life and for the exercise of every useful art should also be opened.

(3) Any unemployed person or youth of either sex should be received into the nearest government school, and trained, and set to the work he or she is fitted for, at a fixed rate of wages.

(4) For the old and the destitute, comfort and home should be provided.

(5) There should also be just payment, diminishing the power of wealth in the hands of one and distributing it through a chain of men.

(6) The rates of wages must be so regulated as not to vary with the demand for labour.

(7) Bodies of workmen should be engaged so as to give them permanent interest in the establishment.

But the essential change that Ruskin contemplated was nothing less than a change of heart. Human happiness could be promoted only by satisfaction and not by unrest.

Colonisation, bringing in of waste lands and discouragement of marriage are suggested as solutions to the problem of the misery of the workers. But the question is not about how much habitable land is in the world, but how many human beings ought to be maintained on a given space of land. Also, it would be interesting to see what proportion the wages of the teachers, doctors, soldiers and clergymen should bear to those of the workers.

Mill regretted the destruction of natural scenery in an age of growing industrialism. But the world cannot become a factory nor a mine. Since men cannot drink steam or eat stone, they will have to set apart some space for growing vegetables and for pure air. The intermediate zones of earth will be loveliest in habitation No scene is constantly loved but one which is full of joyful. human labour. All lovely things are also necessary,—the wild flower as well as the tended corn, for man cannot live by bread alone.

All true advancement towards the felicity of the human race

must be by individual, not public efforts. We must have examples of people who seek, not greater wealth, but simpler pleasure: general measures can only aid such advancement. Such persons must consider what conditions of existence they cause in the producers of what they buy ; secondly, whether it is just payment ; thirdly to how much clear use for food, knowledge or joy, what you have bought can be put ; fourthly, to whom and in what way it can be most serviceably distributed ; showing that the enjoyment depends, not on the quantity of things tasted, but on the patience of taste.

Innocent and exquisite luxury is possible in the future,—luxury for all and by the help of all. But luxury at present can only be enjoyed blindfold, when millions are starving. Lead a life of suffering and simplicity till the gift of bread and peace shall be as easily accessible to the meanest worker as to the richest person.

(*f*) *The Merchant's Place in Society.*

Why is the merchant held in such a low esteem ? The reason is that he is generally believed to be incapable of self-sacrifice. The soldier is more respected because he holds his life at the service of the state. The lawyer, the doctor and the clergyman are also respected on the presumed ground of their unselfishness and serviceableness to the people. But the public instinctively assumes that a buyer's function has been usually to cheapen and the seller's to cheat. Merchants are supposed to practise cozening under cover of commerce.

But a true merchant is as noble as a man of any other profession. Commerce, in this age of industrialism, is the most important of all fields. But men of heroic temper have not yet taken to it in large numbers. If the clergyman teaches the form of a gospel, the merchant can practise it. The market may have its martyrdoms as well as the pulpit ; and trade its heroisms as well as war. Every civilised nation has five great intellectual professions:

(a) *The soldier* *dies* rather than *not* defend his country.

(b) *The clergyman* *dies* rather than *not* teach the truth.

(c) *The doctor* *dies* rather than *not* keep the country in health.

(d) *The lawyer* *dies* rather than *not* enforce justice.

(e) *The merchat* should underetand the qualities of the thing he deals in and the means of obtaining or producing it in perfection. He should know how to distribute it at the cheapest possible price where it is the most needed. He should not consent to any adulteration or unjust or exorbitant pride. His function is to provide for the nation in this manner. He should die rather than not fulfil it. His getting profit for himself is only incidental. It is also his duty to make the various employments involved in the production or transference of merchandise most beneficial to the men employed. He has a paternal authority and responsibility. And he should treat the young men who comes to him as he would his own son. In any commercial crisis, he should take more of the suffering himself rather than allow his men to feel it.

These two functions of the merchant—clean dealing and paternal responsibility—require the highest intelligence as well as patience, kindness and tact, for their right exercise.

(6) *Honesty is not a disturbing force*. It is a consistent and commanding force and the orbit of economy can continue clear of chaos by using it. We should not be honest simply because of the fear of losing employment. There are higher things in life. But honesty is a basic fact.

(g) *The Idea of Justice as Applied to Payment of Labour by Ruskin.*

Equity can only consist in giving time for time, strength for strength and skill for skill. Whether the person who labours for us is our equal, superior or inferior, justice consists in absolute exchange. If a person works for an hour for us, we should neither work for him for an hour and a half, nor for only half-an- hour, but an hour in return.

But the fruit of the labour first given or advanced ought to be taken into account, and balanced by an additional quantity of labour in the subsequnt repayment. Thus if you give me an hour today, I will give you an hour and five minutes on demand. Thus, just wages will consist in a sum of money which will at any time procure for the labourer, at least as much labour as he has given, rather more, than less.

And this *justice of payment* is wholly independent of any reference to the number of men who are willing to do the work. Whether there are twenty or twenty thousand smiths or graduates in the field, the one smith or graduate who is employed must be given his due.

Again, payment in terms of money is universally useful, unlike special labour. It is therefore more valuable. Such a payment is practically an order on the nation for so much work of any kind. Hence a lesser quantity of money making such general toil available will always be accepted as a just equivalent for a greater quantity of special toil. Any craftsman will be willing to give an hour of his own work for an order over half-an-hour of national work.

But it is difficult to determine, in terms of money, the value of human skill or labour,—literary, physical, artistic or otherwise. We do not also know what amount of money a certain quantity of special labour should fetch. Hence it is difficult to ascertain the proper wages of any given labour in terms of money.

But, though not easily known, the work *has* a worth, as fixed and real as the specific gravity of a substance. We know that it is impossible for the mercantile economist himself to find out which is the *cheapest* market to buy and the *dearest* market to sell. Only an approximate idea of it can be obtained by him. Similarly, a just man can also obtain the closest possible approximation to a just price. In fact, it is easier scientifically to determine what a man ought to have for his work than what his necessities will compel him to take for it.

The difference between the just and unjust method of payment does not lie in the number of men hired, for the same number may be hired in both cases. *In the just case the whole price of the first piece* of work goes into the hands of the man who does it; in the unjust case,—only half the price. In the unjust case, two men work for the first hirer. In the just case, one man works for the first hirer, one for the person hired, and so on, down or up through the various grades of service. *The universal and constant action of justice in this matter is, therefore, to diminish the power of wealth, in the hands of one individual,* over masses of men, and to distribute it through a chain of men. This latter case gives each subordi

nate person fair and sufficient means of rising in the social scale, if he chooses to use them. It diminishes the power of wealth in the hands of one individual and also removes the worst disabilities of poverty.

It is on this problem of fixed wages that the destiny of the labourer is ultimately dependent.

Minor reforms like exemption from taxation, the repeal of corn laws and the inauguration of free trade do not help the labourer, for his wages would fall in the same proportion. *His distress arises* on the grand scale from the pressure of unhealthy competition and taking the advantage of it by the purchaser. *Hence he must insist on the organisation of labour with fixed wages.* The army and the navy, for instance, are paid in this manner. The mill-hands in Ruskin's time were paid on the principles of mercantile economy.

The argument for the higher wages of the workman is met by the objection that he will either people down to the same point of misery at which you found him, or drink his wages away. But Ruskin tells us that the poor are not essentially different from us. We can make them wise and sober like ourselves by educating them. The poor should certainly claim their right for education.

The poor may be rough-jacketed and rough-worded. But they are holier than we who have left them thus.

Ruskin was not a socialist. He believed that equality was impossible. He also believed in the eternal superiority of some men to others and in the advisability of appointing such persons to lead their inferiors. But, at the same time, he was up against the exploitation of the poor by the rich. By establishing the payment of just wages, he sought to do away with the misuse of wealth for purposes of pleasure or power. He was not quite a socialist. According to him, the socialist is not right in desiring to make everybody powerless and poor. Nor is the rich man right in leaving the poor in the mire. The difference between Ruskin and the socialist is that, whereas the socialist cries out: "Deprive the rich man of his riches," Ruskin says:—"Teach him to use them to better purpose."

(h) The Relations Between the Employer and the Employed.

The socialists would believe that the interests of masters are antagonistic to those of the workmen; the capitalist economists would believe that they are not. But it does not always follow that the persons must be antagonistic to each other because their interests are.

Again, their interests may be either opposed or alike according to circumstances. But it is in the interests of both that the work should be rightly done and a just price obtained for it. It is not in the interests of the master to pay low wages so as to leave the workman sick, nor that of the workman to clamour for high wages so as to leave the master bankrupt.

The economists think that the greatest average of work will be obtained from the servant and the greatest average of pay from the master by *allowing competition to go on between* servant and servant and master and master. This, they say, will end in the greatest benefit to the community. But the worker is also a human being. The greatest quantity of work will be done, not for pay, but for the affections.

This is easily seen in the case *of domestic servants.* A large quantity of material work may be done under mechanical pressure, under an energetic master and a small quantity of it under a weak master. But such affection as one man gives to another always gives the best results. It at least prevents even an ungrateful servant from being revengeful. We must treat the servant kindly without any economical purpose. Whosoever will 'lose' his life shall 'find' it. This is illustrated by Adam's attitude towards Orlando and Oliver in *As You Like It*. It is also seen in connection with the army. A charge may often be successful though the men dislike their officers; a battle has rarely been won unless they loved the general.

As for the more complicated relation between the manufacturers and his workmen, an action of the affections can take place only if two requirements are fulfilled: (a) *The rate of wages must be so regulated as not to vary with the demand for labour.* Prime-ministerships are not sold by Dutch auction nor are commissions sold. The best labour has always been paid by an invariable standard. All labour ought to be paid like that. Ultimately, the price of labour is indeed regulated

by the demand for it. The right system is that the good workman should be employed and the bad one unemployed rather than allow the latter to work at half-price and force the good worker to do the same. (b) *Bodies of workmen should be employed so as to give them permanent interest in the establishment*, like the soldiers in a 'crack' regiment. The extensive inequalties of demand which necessarily arise in consequence of the modern activities of trade certainly stand in the way of a just organisation of labour. But in its worst aspects, this tendency to make the workman's pay depend on intermittent exertion and the manufacturer's profit on dexterously used chance, is unnecessary. It results merely from a love of gambling on the part of the masters and from ignorance and sensuality in the workmen. The master should induce the workmen to take lower pay for more regular labour rather than allow them to work violently for high wages, subject to the chance of being unemployed. He should not yield to temptations of precarious gain but should rather be the originator of a new movement.

All the disaffections between master and workman will be removed if this is done.

(i) *His Limitations as an Economist* :

Critics are not slow in pointing out the shortcomings of Ruskin as an economist. Many of them have only to be mentioned in order to be admitted. Thus Ruskin's lack of historical knowledge led him into making exaggerated statements and violent assertions—like those about war in *The Crown of Wild Olive.* Again, he undervalued the significance of individual liberty and was for giving too much control to the state over the individual and the family. The Philistinism that had overtaken the people and the ugliness that incarnated itself in several industrial towns, desecrated the loveliness of the countryside and multiplied itself into machine-made articles, made Ruskin swing to the other extreme, adovcate a banishment of all machinery and preach a return to the 'quiet and individual methods of living' that characterised the Middle Ages. But it is utterly fantastic to put the clock back : we must strive to harmonise the basic gifts of industrialism with the deeper needs of the spirit and look forward to a world-brotherhood in which the blessings of civilization do not appear to be either irrelevant or inappropriate.

Nor was Ruskin a blind enemy of industrialism. He objected to the establishment of railways only when they interfered with the quiet and the beauty of the countryside. His furious exaggerations can also be excused for, as a critic has pointed out: "He spoke as a prophet, and the prophet's function is to create a spirit rather than to state a programme."

(j) *The Practical Effect of Ruskin's Economic Theories.*

Ruskin's doctrines are gradually coming into their own and some of them have already been realised in practice, in England. The model villages where industry is not allowed to blacken the scenery; the industrial towns like Port Sunlight, Letchworth and Bourneville which have been specially laid out for the comfort and convenience of the workmen; and institutions like Ruskin College at Oxford: all these bear eloquent testimony to the essential soundness of his teachings. The rise of the Labour Party in England can itself be partly traced to Ruskin's influence.

Miss Cunnington has admirably summed up the practical effect of Ruskin's theories by enumerating the many measures of today in which "may be discerned the practical equivalents of his teachings; his ridiculed proposal of fixed payments for labour is embodied in the acceptance of what is implied in 'the living wage'; his plans for the aged and indigent in the Old Age Pensions; for childhood and youth the extensions of the early Education Acts, and notably the 'Fisher' Act of 1918. The broadening theories underlying the possession of land, covering fixity of tenure and compensation for improvements: and the communal recognition of unprivileged people implied in the compulsory provision by local authorities of allotments, in the preservation of commons and the maintenance of rights of way, are outcomes of the ethical system he upheld. The payment by public bodies (who are at once the representatives and guardians of the community) of the Trades Unions' rates of wages and the shouldering by government and municipalities of responsibility for the housing of the people, are th logical conclusions of his once unpopular, humane assump tions."

Ruskin did a great service to economics by insisting on th essential unity of man and the utter artificiality of 'Econom Man,' just as he had in-

onnection between arts and crafts. The principles of social reform which he tried to enforce are the axioms of present-day politics. Thus, as Mr. Cook says, "To an inquirer of to-day contrasting the central tendencies of political thought with those which were most powerful in the middle of the nineteenth century, these three differences, among others, will present themselves. (1) The thoughts and efforts of reformers are now devoted more to social than to purely political questions. (2) The doctrine of *laissez-faire*, alike in politics and in economics, has lost much of its former hold. Reformers of to-day look rather to co-operation organized by the State, than to the free play of competition, for the improvement of the people. (3) The limits of state-interference have thus been largely extended. Not freedom from external restraint, but free scope fôr self-development, is the ideal of modern reformers. Positive and no longer negative freedom is the aim. Every one of these three principles belongs to the essence of Ruskin's social and political philosophy.

"The student of modern progress has only to consider the policies now carried out, wholly or in part, of which Ruskin was the definite pioneer, to realise the truth of the claim here made. They include policies relating to land reform, the methods of dealing with slums, modern methods of taxation, the scientific treatment of such problems as unemployment, sweating, the care of the aged poor, the hours and condition of labour and the relations between capital and labour, the reform of our educational system, the planning of cities and many others."

J. H. Whitehouse.

(k) *His Economic Ideas as Presented in the Crown of Wild Olive.*

Ruskin traces most of the evils of modern life to a pursuit of money in and for itself. He traces the following evils to Mammon-worship in *The Crown of Wild Olive.*

(a) The production of useless articles by the capitalist because they give him a 'percentage'; (b) the capitalist cares more for his 'fee' or 'profit' than his 'work'. There is no heroism in his exchange. (c) This leads to the accumulation of money, and its subsequent use for waging war. Indeed we

might go a step further and say (d) that by dividing society into 'Workers' and 'Players' it gives rise to all the evils of modern society.

(a) *Production of Useless Articles*:— One of the essential teachings of Ruskin in political economy was his strong condemnation of the production of useless articles and the acquisition of profits or percentage thereon.

Read :—

§ 3—§ 7—Introduction—Crown of Wild Olive.
§ 25—On gambling.
§ 31—§34 —Accumulation of money.
§ 44—§ 45—Useless work.
§ 74—§ 75—Commerce.

Ruskin describes the various methods of acquiring money unjustly,—which he characterizes as "polite robbery". First, there is the dishonest manufacture of useless articles. This kind of theft is worse than open robbery in which some heroism is possible. A highway robber may retain every moral and manly virtue, and become a hero of song. But swindling the public by the sale of useless articles, or by light weights, or false measures is not heroism. "If the Ghost that is in you, whatever the essence of it, leaves your hand a juggler's and your heart a cheat's, it is not a Holy Ghost, be assured of that. And for the rest, all political economy, as well as higher virtue, depends first on sound work." Secondly, there is the dishonest acquisition of money. Wealth, no doubt, may be acquired by honest means, but then there is a limit to it. No large fortunes can be honestly acquired by the work of one man's head or hands. By fair pay for fair labour according to the rank of it, a man can obtain the means of comfortable, or if he needs it, refined life. But he cannot obtain a large fortune. Such fortunes can be made only in three ways: (1) by obtaining command over the labour of multitudes of other men, and using it for his own profit; (2) by treasure-trove—as of mines &c., under his exclusive control and (3) by speculation. In this last, what one loses another gains, and the net result to the state is zero.

The production of useless articles is harmful not only to

those concerned in the transaction but to the whole of society. Ruskin instances the superfluous ornamental work of iron-bridges &c., on railways in England as work of this kind. If the same money had been spent on useful work e.g., buying land for people, or building good houses for them, it would have been used far better.

Letters XIV and XV. of *Time and Tide.*

(b) *Work first or Fee first* ?—This is a point on which Ruskin laid special emphasis and held characteristic views. He refers to it in—

§ 32, and § 41—§ 42 of Work;
§ 74, § 75, § 76, § 80 of Traffic.

Read the section entitled '*The Merchant's Place in Society*' in this connection.

These views supply us the connecting link between Work, Traffic and war.

(c) *The origin of modern war* in the accumulation of money has been sufficiently explained in the text itself.

(d) We finally come to the great division of society into *workers and players.* What is now familiar to us as the great "social problem" was envisaged by Ruskin thus:—

All social evils and religious errors arise out of the pillage of the labour by the idler : the idler leaving him only enough to live on (and even that miserably) and taking all the rest of the produce of his work to spend on his own luxury, or on the toys with which he beguiles his idleness.

And this is done, first by the landlords, and then, under their direction, by the three so-called gentlemanly 'professions' of soldier, lawyer, and priest; and lastly by the merchant and usurer. The landlord pillages by direct force, seizing the land; —the soldier, by persuading the peasantry to fight, and then getting himself paid for skill in leading them to death : the lawyer, by prolonging their quarrels with marketable ingenuity; the priest, by selling the Gospel, and getting paid for theatrical displays of it.

But Peace, Justice and the Word of God must be given to the people, not sold. And these can only be given by a true order of Priests and Kings.

Letter LXXXIV *Fors Clavigera.*

14. Ruskin on War.

(a) *Ruskin's Views on War*:

Ruskin's views on war have excited a good deal of lively speculation. Mrs. Meynell complains that there is a string of paradoxes in his lecture on War. But Mr. Wilenski has nothing but praise for it: "Ruskin wrote the lecture at a moment when his mind was particularly well balanced......It is one of his most interesting productions." In any case, the lecture should be studied with reference to the gradual development of Ruskin's ideas on war. His ideas on art hardly developed after he was fiftynine and on economics after he was sixtytwo. But his thought in the field of war continued to develop even during the succeeding years and reacted admirably to the 'scientific' turn given to modern warfare.

As an undergraduate at Oxford who competed unsuccessfully for the Newdigate Prize in 1838, Ruskin wrote a poem on 'The Exile of St. Helena.' We see the young man's usual worship of Napoleon in this poem:

"He moved, serene as spirits are,
And dying eyes might see
Above his head a crimson star
Burning continually."

He was hardly conscious at this time of the ethical and economic implications of war. Only ten years later Ruskin was to describe Napoleon as a lawless adventurer who changed 'loyalty into license, protection into plunder........."

Even when he was nearly forty Ruskin thought of war as a form of play or as an art. "It is not easy," he wrote in *The Stones of Venice*, I, Appendix 14 (1848—1851), "To distinguish the respect paid to the power from that rendered to the Art of the soldier.........I believe, however, that taking into consideration.........the subtleties both of apprehension and stratagem constantly demanded by it...it must indeed rank as far the first of the arts of the second order......"Ruskin was closely acquainted with several 'professional soldiers of marked gentleness and high character.' This intimacy was partly responsible for preventing him from seeing steadily from the very beginning the disastrous consequences of war. His fondness for reading military history and for playing chess made him

think of war as a 'game of chess in progress.' He thought that army discipline promoted strength, truth, gentleness and simplicity and conveniently overlooked the fact that 'men are not sent into battle to get killed but to kill.'

But a change came over Ruskin's attitude towards war when, while writing *Unto this Last* and *Munera Pulveris*, he came to see that at the bottom of all wars lay the greed and the selfishness of cheating merchants, the stupidity of undiscerning and self-centred women and the mammon-worship of capitalists who advance loans to governments for spending money on armaments. He then came to realise that, sooner or later, every shell, in its nature would blow a roof off. "You may grow for your neigbour," he said in *Unto this Last*, "......grapes or grapeshot; he will also, catalactically, grow grapes or grape-shot for you, and you will each reap what you have sown." There are just wars and unjust wars. But they involve the same misuse and waste of labour and life. These are supported by loans from capitalists and "these loans are repaid by subsequent taxation of the people, who appear to have no will in the matter, the capitalists' will being the primary root of the war." "Precisely according to the number of just men in a nation," he said in *Munera Pulveris*, "is their power of avoiding either intestine or foreign war. All disputes may be peaceably settled, if a sufficient number of persons have been trained to submit to the principles of justice."

This was Ruskin's position with regard to war when he received the invitation to addrese the Cadets of the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich in 1866. Ruskin probably owed it to the good offices of his friend Colonel Edwardes (who had read Wordsworth's *The Happy Warrior* to Ruskin and whose book, *A year on Punjab Frontier*, 1848—1849, was made the subject of a lecture called *A Knight's Faith* by Ruskin in 1883). But the Woolwich authorities did not *know* Ruskin, even as the Bradford merchants were blissfully ignorant of Ruskin's views on economics. The merchants had to be told about it plainly and Ruskin did not mince matters in their presence. But he had to deal more delicately with the cadets at Woolwich. Ruskin tried to check himself in a number of ways. He deliberately avoided any reference to the capitalists' loans which, according to him, were at the root o

all wars. He only tried to 'strengthen the young soldiers trust in the virtue of their profession ? He even went to the length of building up the fantastic theory that war is the foundation of all art and virtue. He even got back for a moment to his old concept of war as a form of play. But the truth would leak out sooner or later. Ruskin's condemnation of all modern or chemical warfare in comparison with the battle of Corinth and of the habit of playing the game of war with a multitude of 'peasant-pieces' must have left the Woolwitch authorities nervous and fidgeting. Again, in his strictures on war for dominion, Ruskin's reference to India and his criticism of imperialism generally must have left them cold and disappointed. His reference to India in this lecture is as eloquent as the other one in *The Pleasures of England*, III, para 81, where he said that the British rule in India had mainly resulted in the introduction of Paisley instead of Cashmere shawls and that "every mutiny, every danger, every terror, and every crime occurring under or paralysing our Indian Legislation, arises directly out of our national desire to live on the loot of India, and the notion always entertained by English young gentlemen and ladies of good position, falling in love with each other without immediate prospect of establishment in Belgrave Square, that they can find in India, instantly on landing, a bungalow ready furnished with the loveliest fans, china and shawls—ices and sherbet at command—four-and-twenty slaves succeeding each other hourly to swing the punkah, and a regiment with a beautiful band to "keep order" outside, all round the house."

Again, his comments on war for defence must have disconcerted them equally. "There is now truer duty to be done in raising harvests than in burning them ; more in building houses than in shelling them." It is, no doubt, noble to die for England if need be. But you must also convince yourselves that the England you are dying for is worthy of you. What is the good of dying for England if you are only to "stand at the shop-door to protect shop-boys cheating inside ?" And Ruskin goes on to criticise the unimaginative women of England as being responsible for all war, since no war could continue without their approval.

Mr. Wilenski suggests that the contents of the lecture would be more accurately entitled 'The Soldier's Part in Peace and War.' It may be so. But the contents themselves sounded so revolutionary in the ears of the Woolwich authorities that they 'filed no account of his lecture in their records, hoping, no doubt, that the young gentlemen would soon forget it."

War is the 'misdeed of an imperfect world.' Wars will not cease from troubling us so long as the world is not a Utopia. And if wars have to be, the only permissible wars are surely the three kinds of war mentioned by Ruskin,—the war-game 'played by gentlemen against other gentlemen in personal combat to prove who has the finer frame, the stronger arm and the steadier heart and, who is consequently the better man;' aggressive war undertaken whenever a country is assured that its authority would be helpful and protective; and war undertaken in order to defend the noblest heritage in one's own motherland. Consequently, all wars in which a group of peasants are shipped away to kill and be killed by another group, 'chemical' wars which involve a colossal waste of life and labour and in which the only question is as to which of the combatants has the longest gun, and wars for dominion and for unjust and unabashed exploitation are abominable, even criminal. Even the three kinds of war must, according to Ruskin, be avoided in course of time. Wars for play will end if the youths of a country are properly occupied.—"Occupy him, early and wisely, in agriculture or business, in science or in literature, and he will never think of war otherwise than as a calamity.' Wars for dominion will cease if 'a sufficient number of persons have been trained to submit to the principles of justice. And, with the discontinuation of all imperialistic wars, there will be no occasion at all for wars for defence. Ruskin himself would 'fain join in the cadence of hammer-strokes that should beat swords into ploughshares' and welcome the Prince of Peace.

It is almost impossible to improve upon what Ruskin has said regarding war and peace. Ruskin is as confirmed a lover of non-violence as Mahatma Gandhi himself, as is seen in his indictment of 'a multitude of human powers', of the lust of dominion and of the 'wholesale destructiveness' of modern weapons of war. But he is also more realistic in his grasp of

world affairs and he makes allowance only for unavoidable and necessary wars and would in no case have advised the Czech to say to Hitler : " I am prepared to meet your onslaught fearlessly, let me receive your bombshells on my bare breast."

The distinction between 'voluntary and conscript service' and the destructiveness of modern warfare continued to occupy his mind even in his later years. "If war is to be waged by money and machinery," he wrote in 1868, "the nation which is the largest and the most covetous multitude will win." The outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War confirmed him in his outlook on war. 'Two nations', he wrote in *Fors Clavigera*, 'may go mad, and fight like harlots—God have mercy on them ; you, who hand them carving knives off the table, for leave to pick up a dropped sixpence, what mercy is there for *you ? ...You must simply rather die than make any destroying mechanism or compound*'. He wrote again in *The Eagle's Nest* : "The misuse we have made of our discoveries will be remembered against us in eternal history......The practical fact which will remain for the contemplation of the future is that we have invented gun-cotton and nitro-glycerine."

He attacked the capitalists as being responsible for all war : "Capitalists when they do not know what to do with their money persuade the peasants in various countries that the said peasants want guns to shoot each other with. The peasants accordingly borrow guns, out of the manufacture of which the capitalists get a percentage and men of science much amusement and credit. Then the peasants shoot a certain number of each other, until they get tired.......And then the capitalists tax both, annually, ever afterwards, to pay interest on the loan of the guns and gun powder." (*Munera Pulveries*, 1871, Preface). He pointed out how they, the shopkeepers, slunk in their homes, for "the persons in arms led out for mutual destruction are by no means the whole nation on either side, but only the individuals of it who are able-bodied, honest and brave, selected to be shot from among its invalids, rogues and cowards." He showed how the money-lenders whose pockets were filled by military finance would "occultly exercise irresistible influence not only on the development of our armaments but also on the deliberations of Cabinets and the passions of the populace." And he wondered how these thievish

capitalists were fools enough not to understand that 'the prosperity of their neighbours is, in the end, their own also.'

Ruskin had also discovered when the Franco-Prussian War was in progress how 'we improve contention of arms with contention of tongues and are able to multiply the rancour of cowardice and mischief of lying in universal and permament print.' But he looked forward to a time when all mischief and crime would be extinct and the Soldiers of the Sword would only be employed in policing the world: "To punish knaves and make idle persons work......that is indeed the ultimate and perennial soldiership; that is the essential warrior's office to the end of time." He grew impatient with the world every time he envisaged the frustration of this noble ideal: "How long is it before these virtues of loyalty and obedience shall be conceived as capable of development, no less in employments which have some useful and fruitful power than in those which are simply the moral organisation of massacre and the mechanical reduplication of ruin?" (*Fors Clavigera*: Letter 79).

Ruskin's final attitude towards war is summed up in the following passage: "The time is certainly drawing near for the workmen, who are conscious of their own power and probity, to draw together into action. They ought first in all Christian countries to abolish, not yet *War*—which must yet be made sometimes in just causes,—but the Armaments for it, of which the real root cause is simply the gain of manufacturers of instruments of death". How essentially sound Ruskin's position was in this matter is shown by the fact that the Covenant of the League of Nations framed after the 1914-18 War included the clause: "The members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections .. .." Hardly twenty years have passed since the Covenant was framed and we find ourselves in the midst of another World War today. But it is only a fresh vindication of Ruskin's position and of his advocacy of a real change of heart and of a fraternity of nations rather than a League.

(*b*) *The Relation of War to Art*:

Mr. Wilenski thinks that Ruskin's theory that war is a foundation of the arts and 'of all the high virtues and faculties

of men' is only his polite introductory bow as the guest of a military institution. But the theory has indeed to be taken more seriously. Ruskin enforces this view as well as the other one that peace and the vices of civil life flourish together in his *The Queen of the Air*, (para 102-105), when he was not under any compulsion to theorise against his own inclinations. Ruskin herein distinguishes three stages in the history of a people—the military stage, the domestic stage and the stage of luxury. In the first stage the whole nation lives a hard and warlike life. The nation is always its own army, and their king, or chief head of government, is always their first soldier. Pharoah, or David, a Leonidas, or Valerius, or Barbarossa, or Cœur de Lion, or St. Louis, or Dandolo—Egyptian, Jew, Greek, Roman, German, English, French, Venetian,—that is the inviolable law for them all: their king must be their first soldier, or they cannot be in progressive power.

After their great military period comes the domestic period during which, without betraying the discipline of war, they add to their great soldiership the delights and possessions of a delicate and tender home life; and then, for all nations, is the time of their perfect art, which is the fruit, the evidence, the reward of their national ideal of character, developed by the finished care of the occupations of peace.

This great period is always followed by the day of luxury. Art is pursued for pleasure only and its decline sets in.

But this kind of reasoning does, no doubt, involve a fallacy. Ruskin's own personal acquaintance with a few professional soldiers of high character made him have a disproportionate respect for the *persona* of the soldier. He thought that the substitution of money power for the martial one in modern times was disastrous and that the wars of the past were noble because the 'whole manhood of the nation, led by their king, was fighting in the field.'

We can understand his condemnation of a nation that fights with a mercenary force or with torpedoes instead of its own arms. He observes that our moral character or our art can never be founded on such 'mechanical' wars—Thu he says in §75, *Time and Tide*; "I believe that the imminent danger to which we are now in England exposed by

the gradually accelerated fall of our aristocracy (wholly their own fault), and the substitution by money power for their martial one; and by the correspondingly imminent prevalence of mob violence here, as in America; together with the continually increasing chances of insane war, founded on popular passion whether of pride, fear, or acquisitiveness, —all these dangers being further darkened and degraded by the monstrous forms of vice and selfishness which the appliances of recent wealth, and of vulgar mechanical art, make possible to the million,—will soon bring us into a condition in which men will be glad to listen to almost any words but those of a demagogue, and to seek any means of safety rather than those in which they have lately trusted." (Cf. § 123 of *War*).

But we cannot subscribe to his view that the rise of Art in Egypt, Greece, Rome and medieval Europe was entirely due to a love of war. If he argues that early Egyptian art consists only of sculptures of kings going out to battle and such other subjects, we can retort by saying that archaeologists may unearth other pieces of sculpture in good time. Moreover, art and war begin with the very beginnings of primitive society and very naturally react on one another. As for Greek art, Ruskin himself admits that agricultural and pastoral life had as much to do with it as war. He makes too sweeping a statement regarding the Romans when he says that the art instinct was wholly wanting in them. What a reflection on the genius of Virgil, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, Seneca and other Roman celebrities! Again, Ruskin thinks that the arts were revived during the age of chivalry when war was loved for the sake of war.' But why *call* it the age of chivalry? Was not religion loved then for the sake of religion? Love, religion and war,—these were the three motives that governed the life of the Middle Ages. Thus we find that war, whether 'mechanical' or personal, is only one of the many themes of art and bears no special affinity to it. War has as little or as much to do with art as pastoral, agricultural, commercial or manufacturing pursuits.

As regards the three stages in history which he enumerates in *The Queen of the Air*, nothing much need be said. He only applies the cosmic cycle of birth, growth and decay to the lives of nations. He also shifts his ground a little when he makes

art the product of the 'domestic' rather than the military period. But an examination of the three periods in history which Ruskin himself cites as instances of the interdependence of art and war has shown us that history is too complex to be summed up by the simple formula evolved by Ruskin.

Now for his main contention that no great art ever yet rose on earth, but among a nation of soldiers. This may be taken along with his other assertion that war is the foundation of all the high virtues and faculties of men. He makes his position even more explicit in *The Queen of the Air* wherein he maintains that, until now, it has been impossible for any nation, except a warrior one, to fix its mind wholly on its men, instead of on their possessions. Every great soldier-nation thinks, necessarily, first of multiplying the bodies and souls of its men, in good temper and strict discipline. As long as this is its political aim, it does not matter what it temporarily suffers or loses, either in number or in wealth ; its morality and its arts (if it have national art-gift) advance together ; but so soon as it ceases to be a warrior nation, it thinks of its possessions instead of its men ; and then the moral and poetic powers vanish together.

It is impossible to subscribe to this view of Ruskin. He is right in so far as he links up art with ceaseless national *activity* in the different departments of life. War is only one of the many forms which this activity assumes ; nor is it the most laudable of them. Socrates, Galileo, Ridley and Latimer are in their own way as great as Alexander, Julius Caesar or Napoleon. The martyrdoms of the church are as much an expression of the human spirit as the heroisms of war. Nation-wide activity, whether it be in the realm of organisation, religion, war or mere thinking, results in a highly charged atmosphere which is favourable to the growth of art. We may say, therefore, that it is this activity which is the foundation of all great art and of all the high virtues and faculties of men.

Again it will be found that when men are not disturbed by wars, they can take to art in a more leisurely and profound manner. Neither war nor peace is in any special way connected with the virtues of civil life. War brings in its wake its own virtues and vices ; so also does peace. If soldiers

are a hell let loose on society during times of war, there are several civilians who always annex a part of society to Pluto's Kingdom. But we need not, therefore, condemn peace as Ruskin does, saying that it brings sensuality, and corruption in its train. The Indian National Movement of 1921 did not believe in war. It adopted non-violence as its 'sheet-anchor'. And yet it aroused such a glorious enthusiasm among the people and called forth such great sacrifices. It was responsible for a nation-wide awakening and for a literary renaissance of far-reaching implications. It was in its own way, as great a moment in the life of India as the Elizabethan period was in the life of England or the 'dawn' of the French Revolution in the life of France. The theory that the arts decline with the advent of peace is conclusively disproved by Frederic Harrison who points out that the Parthenon was nearly contemporary with the comedies of Aristophanes and with the Sophists of Athens,—not with Marathon and Aeschylus.

The right appproach to history, therefore, does not consist in distinguishing between periods of war and periods of peace. Every age and every nation has its own wars to fight. The fact is that there are certain moments in the life of a nation when it progresses miraculously in almost every department of life and certain others when the soul of the nation seems to be slumbering and the soil to lie fallow in order to prepare for a forth coming harvest. And even during these periods of national indolence and indulgence, the human spirit which disregards all barriers and upsets all calculations, is busy enshrining its own message in various art-forms inspite of a hostile environment.

When this is conceded, we may admit that, inspite of the colossal waste of life and labour which it involves, war comes as an opportunity to the strategists to use all their strategy, to the soldiers to put all their heroism to the test and to the thinkers and artists to explore the farthest reaches of the intellect and the imagination. And it does all this because the moment that is fraught with grave issues always brings out the best in man.

(e) ***The separation of civil from military power :—***

Ruskin propounded his theory regarding the disastrous consequ[illegible] from a separation of civil from military

power in his lecture on War to the Woolwich cadets. It is, no doubt, a noble sacrifice to lay down one's life for the defence of one's country. But does the country deserve this sacrifiee on the soldier's part? May not the soldier himself conceivably be the best part of his country? Is he to be only the servant of shop-keepers and have merchants or farmers for his field-marshals? Is he not probably laying down his noble life only to protect shop-boys cheating inside?

It is when he asks these questions that Ruskin puts forward his generalisation: "No country is in a healthy state which has separated, even in a small degree, her civil from her military power." The reason why he generalises in this manner lies in the fact that England's "thoughts need good captain's leading now, if ever!" "Do you know what, by this beautiful division of labour (her brave men fighting, and her cowards thinking), she has come at last to think?" Here Ruskin refers to an article in a newspaper which maintains that "it is the cheapness and abundance of our coal which has made us what we are." This is a degenerate thought and shows that, while the best blood and strength of England is cast into steel and made a mere sword of, its voice and wil being taken away,—the worst part of the nation—whatever is cowardly, avaricious, sensual, and faithless—is given the voice and the authority. Ruskin then proceeds to tell the cade. that "A state without virtue, without laws, and without honour, he is bound *not* to defend; nay, bound to redress by his own right hand that which he sees to be base in her." The soldiers of England must be her tutors; and the captains of her army, captains also of her mind. They must feel for England as well as fight for her.

But is Ruskin so sure that the captains of England's army can also be captains of her mind? He is again over-rating the capacities of the soldier. His own personal contacts with soldiers of high character like Sir Herbert Edwards made him worship the soldier who is very often nothing more than common clay. The soldier may have a reckless love of danger. He is indeed trained to fight. But you cannot expect every soldier to be a Fortinbras, or a Hamlet without his melancholy. He can, at best, be a Laertes. The tragedy o the world consists, as Ruskin points out, in the fact that, mor

often than not, its statesmen in power have been men without vision—rope-dancers and petty-minded intriguers. But to appeal to the soldier is no solution. Not all soldiers are like Sir Herbert Edwards. The solution lies in the possibility of generous and original thinkers and idealists like Carlyle, Ruskin and Newman becoming rulers themselves. If such men have also been familiar with military training, so much the better. But we cannot assume off-hand that the strongest are also the wisest.

But Ruskin's general position in the matter is quite sound: "The health of any state consists simply in this; that in it, those who are wisest shall also be strongest; its rulers should be also its soldiers; or, rather by force of intellect rather than of sword, its soldiers also its rulers." Ruskin is here laying down two principles (a) that the wisest men in a country should be chosen as her rulers; (b) and that those who are in power should themselves be able to fight if need be. As for the first, wisdom has been rarely at the helm, in the history of any country. But whenever it has been given a chance, it has proved its efficacy to the hilt,—during the reigns of Ashoka and Akbar, for example. But wisdom has more often suffered in the wilderness than deliberated in the cabinet. It would indeed be a fortunate thing for the world if wisdom were to come into her own.

As for the second principle, that the rulers should also be soldiers, Ruskin's position has been somewhat misunderstood. His way of thinking has been sometimes supposed to favour the rise of dictatorships. But nothing was farther from Ruskin's thought. He would have been the first to condemn the dictatorial assumption that might is right, that the dictators are the wisest because they are the strongest. Ruskin would have called a dictatorship 'a military despotism? His general reasoning in the matter is essentially sound. Every nation should be able to move as one man. Just as Ruskin insists that the thinker ought also to be working and the worker thinking in a perfect society, he holds that the ruler should be able to wield the sword as well as the pen, and the soldier the pen as well as the sword, in a perfect government. The government grows effeminate if it only goes on issuing orders to the army without realising what hardships the soldier has to face

and what a colossal waste of life and labour is involved in war. The army is reduced to the state of a mercenary horde if it does not know what it is fighting for. Every citizen ought to be able to fight like a soldier at a moment's notice and every soldier ought to exercise his elementary rights as a citizen and have a hand in shaping the policies of his country. Similarly, the captain of an army should know what it is to give the lead to his country 'in front of her thoughts' just as the statesman in the cabinet should know what it is to lead an army, if ever he is called upon to do so. This ensures a state of perfect harmony in the nation. The nation learns to think and act as one man. There is no danger of the 'head' and the 'hand' pulling in different directions for the two are the instruments of the same power which knows how to think and act simultaneously. Whatever the possibilities might be in this regard, we can only say that in a perfect government this state of identification ought to exist between civil and military power.

Ruskin also points out the disastrous consequences that follow closely upon a separation of civil from military power. "All states of the world, however great, fall at once when they use mercenary armies." This is so because the hireling has no cause to fight for except that of his daily bread. A citizen conscripted and trained. on the other hand, is an asset to his country for he realises the nobility of his country's cause and fights for it heart and soul. Again, Ruskin tells us that "a nation once utterly corrupt can only be redeemed by a military despotism—never by talking, nor by its free efforts." When civil and military power are divorced from each other, civil power gradually becomes feeble and effeminate and military power callous and cruel. The result is that mere brute strength dominates the situation. It is only out of the discipline imposed on her by such a despotism and through the suffering inflicted on her by it that a country can hope to recover her former equilibrium. The dictatorships in Italy and Germany can be explained in this way. India also fell from her heights of greatness because there was no co-ordination of her civil and military power. The feudal warriors were interested only in plundering and burning their enemy's territory. The best thinkers in the country cut themselves off from society and

turned their gaze heavenwards. It was only when the strong arm of British imperialism held India in its grip that we began to think of freedom. ' But free effort has not been put forward to the extent to which it ought to be in this direction and there is more 'talking' than 'doing'. Some of us believe that we need more than ever for a short period a high-handed national government which would simply dictate its own solution in certain social and political matters and set the mind of the country free for thinking out more important problems.

Ruskin's position amounts to this:

(*a*) Every individual in a nation should perfect himself in as many ways as possible and try to be a hero at all points. The soldier should also be a citizen and the citizen a soldier. The captain should also be able to play the role of a statesman and the statesman that of a captain. (*b*) All the departments of government—legislative as well as executive—should influence and correct each other and work together in a harmony born of genuine agreement, and understanding, if a nation is to prosper. (*c*) The wisest of its citizens should always be chosen by a country to be its rulers. They should also be the strongest in order to ensure that their measures are invariably translated into action in all the spheres of national life.

15. Ruskin as Stylist.

(1) *The Influences on his Style.*

In any history of English prose," says Mr Fowler, "Ruskin must occupy a permanent place. He is certainly one of the greatest masters of English prose style. Language is a flexible instrument in his hand and he bends it to many uses: argument, pictorial description, eulogy, invective, persuasion, passionate appeal. He is plain and simple as in the *Elements of Drawing* and emotional when his feelings are deeply stirred as in *The Stones of Venice*. In his prose are first met the eye of the landscape-painter and the voice of the lyric poet.

"His style owes something to Locke and Hooker and Doctor Johnson. But most of all it is indebted to the Authorised Version of the Bible. He read and assimilated it from his

very childhood so that he could call it forth whenever he liked The Bible coloured both his thought and diction.

"The constant study of the Bible coloured alike Ruskin's thought and his style; it is ingrained in the texture of almost every piece from his pen."

As Prof. Elton says:—"From the Bible comes much of the best of Ruskin's language and cadence: it is never far off in his magic melodies; no other literary influence can be compared with it."

It was also his practice to translate daily a passage or two from Plato. Among English writers Johnson and Pope had a decisive influence upon Ruskin's style. But 'in its flexibility, vivacity and grace, it is peculiarly his own. Its fault is grandiloquence, its virtue majesty.'

(2) *The Three Kinds of Style.*

It is difficult to generalize about Ruskin's style, because of its immense range and variety. The style of his earlier writings e. g. *The Modern Painters* is quite different from that of his lectures on Art and Political Economy delivered in the middle of his life; and this again is different from the discursive manner of his *Fors Clavigera* or from the beautiful tenderness of his *Praeterita*.

Ruskin was aware of this difference in style. Speaking of the Notes published in the *Art Journal* he says (Q. of A § 134): "I am sorry that they are written obscurely—and it may be thought affectedly: but the fact is, I have always had three different ways of writing—one, with the single object of making myself understood, in which I necessarily omit a great deal of what comes into my head; another, in which I say what I think ought to be said, in what I suppose to be the best words I can find for it (which is in reality an affected style, be it good or bad): and my third way of writing is to say all that comes into my head for my own pleasure, in the first words that come, retouching them afterwards into approximate grammar.' *Fors* and *Praeterita* are excellent illustrations of the last kind.

This difference between the earlier (affected) and the latter (simple) style Ruskin has illustrated thus:

"People used to call me a good writer then; now they say I can't write at all; because, for instance, if anybody's house is on fire, I only say, Sir, your house is on fire': whereas formerly I used to say, Sir, the abode in which you probably passed the delightful days of youth is in a state of inflammation', and everybody used to like the effect of the two 'p's in 'Probably passed' and of the two 'd's in 'Delightful days'."

The Crown of Wild Olive illustrates all the three kinds of style. His statements are direct and concise as when he enumerates details, describes processes or enunciates principles. This is seen in the passages in which he distinguishes between work with the head and work with the hand; the concluding passage of the lecture on Traffic: and in the description on the 'beautiful mansion of the wordly-minded Englishman.' He here suppresses 'allusiveness and luxury of expression'.

He uses the second style "while making out a case, from a strong sense of duty and conviction, against what he considered erroneous." This is seen in what Ruskin says about the Goddess of Getting-on, the capitalists who ought to be captains of labour and the kings who ought to be 'royal labourers.'

The third style is one of impassioned description and concentrated emotion. It is seen in the closing passage of the Preface ('No proud one!' etc.) and in outbursts like, 'I tell you, gentlemen of England, if ever you would have your country breathe the pure air of heaven again" etc. (see lecture on War.)

(3) *His Methods of Work.*

We may notice one or two peculiarities about Ruskin's habitual method of composition. He says in *Praeterita* (Page 351):

"My own literary work was always done quietly and methodically as a piece of tapestry. I knew exactly what I had got to say, put the words firmly in their places like so many stitches, hemmed the edges of chapters round with what seemed to me graceful flourishes, touched them finally with my cunningest points of colour, and read the work to papa and mamma at breakfast next morning as a girl shows her samplar."

Of course a great deal of thinking and reading and observation were necessary before Ruskin could gather the material for composition; he would then take the greatest pains in the

selection of right words. This search for the right word, for the fitting sentence, was often long ; and paragraphs and chapters were written over and over again before they satisfied him.' The text was revised right up to the moment of printing and even as it was going through the press. Nor did the process stop here ; a new edition meant further refinement. A comparison of the changes Ruskin introduced in the various editions of his writings is an excellent exercise in the art of literary composition. The lectures in *The Crown of Wild Olive* have been thus altered. Such alterations as are significant have been pointed out in the Notes.

It happens, moreover, that the most popular works of Ruskin are his lectures. This is the reason for the rhetorical peculiarities of *The Crown of Wild Olive.* Ruskin was very skilful in adapting his lectures to his audience. He was always anxious to enter into their spirit, and to put them in a good mood. To illustrate from the text: He would address the workmen as his 'laborious friends.' He would assure them: "Neither, as you well know, is it to you specially that I say it. I am sure that most now present know their duties of kindness, and fulfil them, better perhaps than I do mine." To the merchants, he would say—"I know that none of the wrong is done with deliberate purpose. I know, on the contrary, that *you* wish your workmen well."

His fondness for alluding to contemporary events, persons or policies is also seen in *The Crown of Wild Olive.* He here refers to the Colenso controversy and to the foreign policy of England. Again, he was in the habit of enhancing the effect of his appeal by reading extracts from newspapers. He also holds the attention of his audience by ironic or by solemn comments.

(4) *His Vocabulary, Syntax and Paragraph-building.*

a. Vocabulary: As already noted, Ruskin was very particular in the choice of words. "Steeped in the words of the Bible as he was, he was able to keep the vernacular part of his vocabulary fine as well as pure." He had the happy instinct of using the right word in the right place. As he said: "The constant habit to which I owe my (often foolishly praised) 'command of language'—of never allowing a sentence to pass

proof, in which I have not considered whether, for the vital word of it, a better could be found in the dictionary—makes me somewhat morbidly intolerant of careless diction."

The student should note the following peculiarities.

(i) *Words used in their original and deeper senses.*

"So that all nations have held their days honourable, or 'holy' and constituted them 'holydays' or 'holidays,' by making them days of Rest." § 36.

"Divine service will be 'performed' (that's our word, the form of it gone through)." § 39.

"And so sanctifying wealth into "Common-Wealth." § 84.

"The word loyalty which means faithfulness to law." § 109.

(ii) *Fondness for using compound words.*

"Gladness fain-hidden, but full-confessed."

"dead fallen" air of battle" § 11.

"torrent-bitten, snow blighted." § 64.

"Crimson-veined marble." § 84.

(iii) *Words used in a special sense.*

"Play" § 28. Lecture on Work.

"*Occupying* a country with one's gifts."

(iv) *Coining new words.*

"Fee-first" § 33; "Bag-baron and Crag-baron" § 34.

"World-father's proper payment" § 41.

"He has to cross a wild *hill-desert*" § 62.

"We ought to have an opposite word '*hateliness*,' to be said of things which deserve to be hated." § 56.

"Pedlar-errants" § 75. "*Peacocky* motives" § 118.

"This is a vital or rather *deathful* distinction" § 78.

"*Cannonry* instead of chivalry" § 128.

(v) *Use of weak superlatives.*

"The strongest and cunningest got them" § 34.

"Easiest, or advisablest, or profitablest to do" § 39.

(vi) *Quaint allusions*:

"Their doublets are too irregularly slashed, or as Chaucer calls it 'all to-slittered' though not for "queintise" § 27.

(vii) *The use of old or obsolete forms of words.*

"Give me *adulterate* food" § 43.
"Cover his table with *delicates* § 80.

(viii) *Personification.*

"Which the clear water nevertheless chastises to purity" § 1.

Sentences:—Rhetorically considered, Ruskin's sentences tend to be loose, rather than periodic. In a period the meaning is suspended till almost the last word; on the other hand, in a 'loose' sentence the qualifying and explanatory adjuncts are tacked on to the words they refer to.

"To speak in school terms the main clause prolongs itself, not by a chain of dependent clauses, but by a series of absolute or otherwise supplementary ones, loosely though quite correctly hung; thought giving birth to thought, and image to fiery image with much the same air of inevitable after-thought as in Shakespeare's poetry, for just so long as the matter may demand."

This does not mean, however, that Ruskin habitually used long sentences. He was an equally great master of short sentences. The latter are characterised by depth of meaning and by perfection of structure. As Mr. E. T. Cock says: "Ruskin was a master of he long sentence as well as the short. His long rolling sentences with their triumphant rise and fall have in them something of those ideas of infinity and continuity which are elements in his 'typical Beauty'. And his mastery of the resources of English is shown not more in epigram and irony, than in those grand sentences in which many clauses are co-ordinated. many lesser ideas balanced, many strands woven into one great tissue which comes from the writer's pen as from a loom."

Ruskin's style may be described as "Pointed Style," the style that consists in the profuse employment of the balanced ... in conjunction with Antithesis, Epigram and Cli...

Illustrations :—

(i) Period: And take also etc. § 58.
By the monks § 66.

(ii) *Antithesis with Balance* (when the different clauses of a compound sentence are similar in form, they are said to be balanced.)

"There are different kinds of slaves and different masters" § 119.

"The Gothic architecture of Venice had arisen out of, and indicated in all its features, a state of pure national faith, and of domestic virtue; and that its Renaissance architecture had arisen out of, and in all its features, indicated a state of concealed national infidelity, and of domestic corruption." § 65.

"The production of a faithful and virtuous, not of an infidel and corrupted, people." § 66.

"You choose brave death in a red coat before brave life in a black one." § 118.

"Back sliding, indeed! I can tell you, on the ways most of us go, the faster we slide back the better. Slide back into the cradle, if going on is into the grave: back, I tell you: back—out of your long faces, into your long clothes." § 51.
"Men must either hereafter live .....anything after death. § 13.

(iii) *Italicising words for emphasis* :

"And this is no small distinction. It is between life and death '*in*' a man, between heaven and hell '*for*' him." § 32.

"Was this grass of the earth made green for your shroud only, not for your bed? and can you never lie down '*upon*' it, but only '*under*' it?" § 16.

(iv) Ruskin illustrates *a trick of composition* thus :

"Luxury is indeed possible in the future—innocent and exquisite; luxury for all and by the help of all."

There, he said, is affectation! "Remains of my old bad trick of putting my words in braces, like game, neck to neck, and leaving the reader to untie them."

He would revise the sentence thus :

"Luxury is indeed possible in the future—innocent because

granted to the need of all; and exquisite, because perfected by the aid of all."

The following is an example of the same trick:

"And yet, in this public quarrel, you take your servants' sons from their arms to fight for it, and your servants' food from their lips to support it; and the black seals on the parchment of your treaties of peace are the deserted hearth and the fruitless field" § 98.

(v) *Epigrams*:

A true wife, in her husband's house, is his servant; it is in his heart that she is queen.

Our danger in life is not death, but temptation.

You do not learn that you may live; but live that you may learn.

What we like determines what we are. § 56.

(c) *The Paragraph*:

Ruskin was a master in the art of exposition, and he could be rigidly precise in defining his ideas and connecting them as in *Munera Pulveris.* But in his public lectures he was often led away by a passing thought or fancy, though he would always return to the subject on hand. A reference to the summary of the lectures will bear out this statement. The student of Ruskin is bewildered in the beginning by his sudden transitions from art to economics and from economics to religion. But, for Ruskin, they were all *one.*

Attention may be drawn to a device by which he linked up his paragraphs. He would often select some telling phrase from the concluding sentence of a paragraph and repeat it in the beginning of the next. Cf. Paragraphs: 38-39; 40-41-42; 101-102; 125-126; 128-129; 52-53; 54-55.

(5) *The Qualities of His Style.*

(a) *Word-music*:

Melody is 'agreeable sound or modulation in general.' "Under melody there are two things that we may consider. First, whether an author conforms to the general laws of melody,—the avoiding of harsh effects; the alternation of long

and short, emphatic and unemphatic syllables ; the alternation of consonants among themselves, and vowels among themselves ; the avoiding of unpleasant alliterations ; the cadence at the close. Second, what is the prevailing rhythm, tune or strain, and how far this is varied."

Now Ruskin is famed as much for word-painting as for word-music. He had the 'misfortune' as he bitterly complained in after-life, of setting his words somewhat prettily together, so much so that many people thought of the words only and not of the meaning.

He is very fond of Balance and Alliteration. He also depended very much upon Assonance for this effect, meaning by Assonance, as distinct from Alliteration, "the recurrence of the same or of cognate sounds, not merely in the first letters of words, but where the stress comes, in any part of the word and that in sounds whether vowel or consonant."

Cf. "The deserted hearth and the fruitless field."

'There are always the elements to fight with, stronger than men, and nearly as merciless.'

Prof. Elton has drawn attention to Ruskin's fondness for admitting a number of lines of blank verse in his prose, and the iambic movement of some of his sentences. Sometimes even rhymed couplets are to be found in his writings.

Cf. "With a ray here and a flash there,
And a shower of jewels everywhere" § 50.

(b) *Poetic prose* :

Ruskin the prophet almost becomes a poet when he speaks of his vision of the Life Beautiful. Cf. his interpretation of the Crown of Wild Olive towards the close of the preface. His lyricism is sometimes concentrated in a single sentence as in his description of 'the windy slope of Wharnside ...torrent-bitten, snow-flighted" or in his great declaration about peace : "I, for one, would fain join in the cadence of hammer-strokes that should beat swords into plough-shares." Then there is the great passage towards the close of the lecture on War. "I tell you, gentlemen of England, if ever you would have your country breathe the pure air of heaven again......captains also of her mind." The passage about the women of Europe [illegible]

ing down on 'the pit of the circus of slaughter' is also an instance of impassioned prose.

(c) *Descriptive power:*

This is one of Ruskin's rare gifts. The beautiful description of the Carshalton pools is a 'purple patch'. The pools in all their transparency present a grim contrast to the ugly Croydon railings. His description of London as a 'huge billiard table without the cloth' is also effective.

(d) *Quotations:*

Ruskin quotes from Dante, Milton, Wordsworth and many others. But his most significant quotations are from the Bible. There are more than sixty texts drawn from the Bible in the first lecture alone. As to why Ruskin quotes so often from the Bible has been explained in the section on 'Ruskin's Views on Religion' in the introduction. He closes each of these three lectures with quotations from the Bible.

(e) *Irony*: Ruskin is fond of irony. He speaks of the game of war and of our 'dressing for it more finely than for any other sport.' He refers to the suggestion of Justice to capitalists to leave their own children to sweep the crossing and 'to take the little sweeper to church in a hat and feathers' every alternate Sunday. Irony almost broadens out into kindly humour when he comments on Christ's saying: "Suffer little children to come unto me..." "I believe most mothers who read that text think that all heaven is to be full of babies." His ironic picture of the private gentleman's steel-traps ends with the solemn sentence: "But when the whole world turns clown and paints itself red with its own heart's blood instead of vermilion, it is something else than comic, I think". Note also the exquisite picture he draws of the Goddess of Getting-on and of the average Victorian's 'beautiful mansion with two wings.'

(*f*) *Conversational ease*: This is seen in sentences like "the public-house-keeper on the other side of the way presently buys another railing to out-rail him with." He is fond of antitheses and puns as in his reference to 'Working-men's College' and 'Idlemen's College and to 'crag-barons' and 'bag-barons'. We should also note the way in which he makes his lectures lively by using imaginary dialogues as in the fifth paragraph of the second lecture.

(*g*) Ruskin also strengthens the appeal of his lectures by asking questions and by using the devices of balance and repetition. "Are you satisfied then to become the servants of shopkeepers?" "There is no true potency, remember, but that of help; nor true ambition, but ambition to save."

All these qualities of style contribute as much to the elocutionary as to the literary effect of Ruskin's lectures.

(5) *Individuality, Truth and Beauty in style.*

"Every fine style should have individuality, truth and beauty. By truth we mean the use of language with a precise appreciation of its niceties of meaning; selecting the plain word if it be the fit word and not taking a sonorous word for the sake of sound. By beauty we mean an intimate knowledge of the subtle modulations of language.

"There are writers who have one or more of the qualities but not all. A 'writer' with no particular message and no depth of soul, will often attain to such beauty as comes from a suggestive use of language, and yet fail to affect us because he is deficient in truth. But to attain a great style, all these are needed. Hence to say that a writer possesses a great style is really equivalent to saying that he is a great man.

"All these three are to be found in Ruskin more than in any other 19th century prose-writer. The personal element which is the source of all individuality in style is to be found abundantly in him in his frankness, lucidity and greatness. He also possesses in an unexampled degree the qualities of truth and beauty. He becomes almost philological in the minute patience with which he will take a word, explain its growth and extricate all its shades of meaning before he will use it. No professor would take more exhaustive care to convey his exact meaning by the use of words in their exactest sense. And as regards the sense of beauty, the art of producing fine and modulated music from the various combinations of language, Ruskin has no peer. But it is not the charm of beauty only, it is the charm of truth. Amid all this pomp of language, there is not one word that does not perform its duty. In his later writings Ruskin's style is more unadorned. Still, through-

out, there is the same charm of style, always satisfying the sense of beauty by "linked sweetness long drawn out" and the sense of truth by the precision of its effect; and last of all, the soul by the force of its spiritual fervour and moral earnestness."

(6) *Defects.*

But the style has its faults as well. (a) "It suffers from a tone of dogmatic over-emphasis;" and there is an excess of imagery, and an inordinate length of sentences. There are also wild and unrestrained rhetorical outbursts. "These unrestrained outbursts of passionate rhetoric are the chief stains on his prose style, though there is an attempt at a corrective in the later works." (b) His power of eloquence is very elusively employed by him. He never *criticises* but declaims against anything he dislikes. He uses his powers to exalt what he is pleased with and to cry down what he dislikes. Thus in *The Stones of Venice*, to make his picture of St. Mark's all the brighter, he intentionally gives a gloomy picture of an English Cathedral. He mentions the number of crows in an English Cathedral and of the 'snowy doves' in St. Mark's. But nothing is there to prevent crows from crowding in at St. Mark's. Again, there is furious exaggeration in his ghastly picture of London and in his statements on war and peace. "There is no art among a shepherd people, if it remains at peace;" "All the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war", etc.

Still, he is one of the greatest masters of English prose style. Harrison says: "No writer of prose has before or since, rolled forth such mighty fantasies or reached such pathetic melodies in words or composed such long books in one sustained strain of limpid prose."

16. A. Brief Account of the substance of Ruskin's Teachings in the Crown of Wild Olive.

A detailed analysis has been given in the preceding pages, of Ruskin's views on art, architecture, economics, war, religion and other topics. We may now sum up the results of our investigation with reference to the teachings incorporated in *The Crown of Wild Olive.*

The most important teachings of Ruskin in the book centre round economic problems. The dominant idea common to all the lectures concerns the ultimate meaning of the business men

have in hand, whether they be operatives, merchants or soldiers. Do they believe in the immortality of the soul? Do they believe in an after life? Do Ruskin's Christian readers believe in the Bible which is the very foundation of their faith? These are the questions that Ruskin asks of his audience and his readers. His breadth of mind and his catholicity of outlook are borne out by the fact that he denies altogether the assumption that the absence of such a belief is inconsistent with purity of character or energy of hand. Many heathens led and still lead a saintly life. Even an atheist can lead—as many atheists have done—an exemplary life. No belief either in the immortality of the soul or in the after life is necessary for ordering one's conduct wisely and well. 'Fate may be bravely met, and conduct wisely ordered,' on either expectation." All that matters is the genuine desire, on the part of every individual, to stand for "grey honour and sweet rest, free-heartedness and graciousness, and undisturbed trust, and requited love, and the sight of the peace of others, and the ministry to their pain."

This great rule of life which Ruskin taught with such passion and power from time to time had been grossly sinned against by the capitalists of the Industrial Era. The political economists of the Manchester School were equally to blame for they evolved an economic theory which hardened the capitalists in their selfish pursuit of money and encouraged them to revel in their ignorance and injustice. Ruskin exposes the capitalists and their theorists in the preface as well as in the three lectures, with the lynx-eyed sharpness of his logic. He points out in his exquisite exposition of the significance of the springs of the Wandle and the Croydon railings how the capitalist is interested only in charging his percentage and not in the usefulness or otherwise of the articles he produces. The baron of old times was an open robber. The modern capitalist comes in as a cheating pedlar. He exploits the poor people in present-day society as the baron exploited the serfs and the peasantry. The capitalist takes all the produce of the poor man's labour to himself, except the labourer's food. As Ruskin says in his lecture on Work, 'Bags and crags have just the same result on rags.' It is only when the grown-ups become as little children in their spirit that the scales will fall away from their

eyes. In his lecture on 'Traffic,' Ruskin ridicules the capitalist's worship of the Goddess of Getting-on and offers ironical suggestions for decorating the Exchange which the Bradford merchants wanted to build. He gives a satirical picture of the English gentleman's 'beautiful mansion with two wings' and shows how the Market should have its martyrdoms as well as the pulpit, and Trade its heroisms as well as War. Kings and captains of industry should be royal labourers governing loyal labourers and adopt a simple order of existence. In his lecture on 'War' he condemns the shopkeepers who reduce their best men to the degradation of being merely the police of their manufacturing towns and the beadles of their little Bethels, and exposes their cunning and cowardice in fighting out their own quarrels with the lives of the poor. Further, Ruskin attacks the political theory which is the logical result of capitalism, imperialism. The ultimate strength of a nation, he observes, lies, not in the mere increase of numbers or extension of territory, but in its capacity for kindness and justice. There is no true potency but that of help; nor true ambition, but ambition to save.

As for the political economists, he exposes relentlessly in the preface the dangerous implications of their notion that 'Business is always good whether it be busy in mischief or in benefit' and their fallacy of the other kind of robbery.—that of deceiving the poor by selling them useless things. What matters is the kind of work to which the labourers are put. If the work is useful, it does not matter if the wages are low. The distinction between the poor and the rich is bound to remain in so far as every man has a right to accumulate what he has justly earned. But it becomes unlawful when existing capital is used only in order to earn more. With all rightly trained men, work comes first and fee second. The poor should be shown, not charity, but justice. It is the rich who are responsible for their misery, not Providence. Those who have got to do manual work must have handsome wages, appointed hours of rest, amusements and the same right to education as the rich have. Again, as Ruskin observes in his lecture on Traffic, the capitalist's so-called science of political economy is no science at all because 'it has omitted the study of exactly the most important branch of the business,—the study of *spending*!

It teaches that to do the best for oneself is to do the best for others whereas the fact is exactly the reverse. In his lecture on 'War' Ruskin makes fun of those who attribute the greatness of England not to her past wisdom, or her qualities of head and heart, but to her cheap and abundant coal.

In the same way, Ruskin has something to say to artists and architects. He dwells rather too strongly on the ethical character of art. He thus holds dogmatically that the greatest picture would always convey to the mind of the spectator the greatest number of ideas. Nor can we say that art is always the expression of national morality. Some of the noblest pictures and buildings were painted and built during periods of great national degeneration and corruption. His condemnation of a picture by Teniers, of sots quarrelling over their dice, as 'an entirely base and vile picture' is unjustified. But his great virtue in this sphere is that he made people realise that "art was no longer to be regarded as an embellishment of life, but a thing necessary to its redemption from brutality, a thing necessary to make life human." In observing that a picture is the record of a soul', he rediscovered the principle of Milton that a true poet must make his life a poem.

His studies in architecture are even more important because he was one of the very first critics in England to make the public realise the value of architecture as a fine art. He developed the view that architecture is a nation's autobiography and showed that when architecture is truly national, its spirit 'pervades the temple and the palace alike' Ruskin suffered from very serious limitations as a critic of architecture. He was not fully alive to the beauty of Renaissance architecture. In his anxiety to prove that every great national architecture is the result and exponent of a great national religion and that architecture declines as religious fervour dies out, he relates the Greek, the Medieval and the Renaissance styles of architecture rather too closely to the religions of the times. But the fundamental doctrine that the final test of the excellence of a work of art is the spirit of which it is the expression is sound and the unexpected way in which he links up the goddess of Getting-on with factory-chimneys and warehouses is indeed a marvellous stroke of imagination. Very few will be taken

in by his advocacy of the Gothic style but almost every one will agree with him in his sympathy for the workman who is condemned to soulless and imitative labour. Ruskin uses even architecture as an argument for the reformation of victorian capitalists. The market must have its heroisms if a good architecture for exchanges is to be possible.

Ruskin's views on War were also startling enough to the public for whose consideration they were offered. He never favoured 'the play of plays, the great gentleman's game, which ladies like them best to play at,—the game of War! He made fun of its 'scarlet and gold, and all manner of fine colours, He condemned the costliness of the game all of which is paid for 'by the hard labourer's work in the furrow and furance,'—not to speak of its consequences. His fantastic theory that war is the foundation of the arts and of all the high virtues and faculties of men and that peace and the vices of civil life flourish together was only his 'polite introductory bow as the distinguished art critic and the guest of a military institution!' He himself would 'fain join in the cadence of hammer-strokes that should beat swords into ploughshares!' But the world being imperfect, wars could not be eliminated. But we could, at least avoid a colossal and criminal waste of life and money and fight our own wars without staking the lives of the poor. We should, in any case, avoid modern or chemical war. Again, wars can be fought in order to face surrounding evil and to help nations that stand for a noble cause. But mere lust of dominion or of imperial expansion is in itself a vile thing and it can only lead to Satanic wars. Wars for defence are also justified. But the soldiers should not be turned merely into the beadles of manufacturing towns. As a matter of fact, no country should separate her civil from her military power. The soldiers must think and feel as well as fight for their country. 'The soldiers of England must be her tutors; and the captains of her army, captains also of her mind'.

The Crown of Wild Olive is indeed a veritable mine of wisdom. Ruskin has also many memorable and interesting things to say about education, taste, childhood, work and play, power, kingship, womanhood, conduct, honour, industry and commerce. But as all these topics are dealt with

unintermittently and in a brief space by Ruskin, the student's attention is drawn to the section entitled '*Ruskin as Moralist.*'

17. The Crown of Wild Olive as the Work of a Prophet.

(A brief appreciation of the book)

Harrison remarks that these lectures of Ruskin contain 'some of his best remarks on work, industry, trade, conduct, education and honour.' True work, said Ruskin in his first lecture, meant the production of the means of life. He said that work in Victorian England was a curse instead of a blessing. The central question of the lecture is, what is the proper ideal of education ? The question cannot be answered unless we know what kind of *work* a man is expected to do. This leads Ruskin to examine the distinction between the upper and the lower classes. The distinction is not the same as that between the rich and the poor or the idlers and the workers. Ruskin considers the problem of the industrious alone and divides them into four classes. "Everyone ought to take some share in work, according to his powers : some working with the head, some with the hands; but all acknowledging idleness and slavery to be alike immoral." (Collingwood). Ruskin has infinite contempt for the idle rich. The basic problem regarding work concerns the distribution of hard work. Who is to do it ? Ruskin here sets up the standard of social justice and not that of mere charity. Both kinds of work are equally necessary and the same men cannot do both. Rough men must do rough work, noble men must do noble work. Rough work takes the life out of us. Whoever has to do it, therefore, must be enabled to do it in an ordered, soldierly and human way. He must be properly paid, comforted and amused. Ruskin said, as he had said before in *Unto This Last* that justice demanded that "equal energy expended should bring equal reward. He did not consider it Justice to cry out for the equalisation of incomes, for some are sure to be more diligent and saving than others; some work involves a geat, preliminary expenditure of energy in qualifying the worker, as contrasted with unskilled labour. But he did not allow that the possession of capital entitled a man to unearned increment, and he thought that, in a community where a truly civilized morality was highly developed, the general sense of society would recognise an average standard

of work and an average standard of pay for each class." (Collingwood). The lecture is thus a denunciation of the contemporary systems of education, political economy and industrialism.

The lecture on Traffic, with its indictment of 'the Goddess of Getting-on' was 'as daring a sermon as ever phrophet preached': Ruskin had been invited to lecture at Bradford in the hope that he would give some useful advice towards the design of a new Exchange which was to be built. Apparently the organisers of the function were not familiar with Ruskin's work as a political economist after 1860 or even with his chapter on the 'Nature of Gothic' in *The Stones of Venice*. It seems that they knew him only as the author of *Modern Painters* and *The Seven Lamps*. But Ruskin did not mince matters. 'I do not care about this Exchange', said Ruskin, 'because *you* don't. A good architecture for Exchanges was possible only if the market had its heroisms. Architecture is great or otherwise according to the national life which it expresses. Ruskin exposed the doctrine of political economists that "to do the best for yourself is finally to do the best for others" and called upon the capitalists to realise that they owed a duty towards the poor. The function of commerce was to provide for society and not to exploit it. The lecture thus deals with the questions of taste, architecture, commerce and political economy.

Mrs. Meynell remarks that the third lecture bears 'signs of flagging life and that the incomparable vitality that Ruskin has in gentleness, in play, in gravity, in violence—in exaggeration itself which wastes the life of all other writers,' is replaced in it by 'vivacity and excitement'. Ruskin was not quite at home in speaking to the young soldiers. The very fact that he, a lover of peace, was speaking to soldiers, was itself a paradoxical situation. Accordingly, the lecture itself is full of paradoxes. "All the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war." "There is no art among a shepherd people if it remains at peace," etc. We usually speak of war as the enemy of art, culture and morality and as a futile waste of the human life and human resources. But compelled by the paradox which he had to face, Ruskin 'dwelt upon another side of teaching of history......with unexpected emphasis'. Ruskin warned the soldiers against becoming the servants of shopkeepers and the

upper classes against deciding their quarrels by staking the lives of the poor. He analysed the ghastliness of modern warfare while discussing the three kinds of war,—war for play, war for dominion and war for defence. Finally, he appealed to the women of England to help to abolish all war.

In the preface, Ruskin opens the question of the 'appointment made by capital of the kind and object of labour'. Mill and other economists had dealt with the subject in their own way. But Ruskin sees waste and 'inutility' in places where others 'were not aware of it,'—in the iron railings set up before a Croydon public house, for example. Less than half the labour bestowed on these useless railings, he says, would have cleansed the pools of Carshalton and removed the heaps of dust and slime cast into them. Having discussed the question of useful and useless labour, he proceeds to speak of religion and makes very significant remarks on the subject.

While Ruskin was a relentless critic of Victorian England, he did not content himself only with pointing out the evils of the day. He also envisaged a better order of life and tried to present it in great detail to the public. The satirists are there only to exhaust their 'storage of bile.' They denounce their fellow-men and indulge in open calls of doom. Persius, Juvenal, Marston, Hall, Swift,—all these and many other satirists either thunder at our sins or laugh at our follies. But prophets like Ruskin also point the way to repentance and to a new heaven and a new earth. If the satirist succeeds in arousing in us a mood of utter self-disgust and of infinite contempt for the society around us, the prophet exalts our imagination and ennobles and strengthens our hearts to "bear all naked truths' and to proceed with the work of reconstruction and regeneration.

It is not possible to accept all the views propounded in this book by Ruskin. Though he had many fine things to say about taste, work, power, kingship, womanhood, conduct, honour and industry, he very often drove an undeniable truth too far and emphasised ethical values at the expense of the aesthetic values of life. He indulged, for instance, in exaggerated statements like the one about peace and the vices of civil life flourishing together. Nor can we hold with Ruskin that art is a 'function' of national morality. His study of architec-

ture suffered very often from a lack of systematic learning or patient reasoning. His plea for the revival of Gothic was bound to go unheeded, for styles in architecture change inevitably as in any other department of life. Similarly, his exhortation to return to the 'quiet and individual methods of living' that characterised the Middle Ages was a retrogressive, rather than a progressive step. His dogmatic over-emphasis and unrestrained rhetoric sometimes spoil his case even when it is essentially sound.

But when due allowance is made for all these limitations of Ruskin, it will be found that *The Crown of Wild Olive* is still a master piece whose message and beauty will continue to stir the hearts of men and women wherever English literature is studied. The title itself sums up the message that Ruskin had both for the godly and the godless,—the possibility of grey honour and sweet rest, free-heartedness and graciousness. In an age when education was considered to be only a caste-mark, a way of distinguishing between the upper and the lower classes, Ruskin defined the true ideal of education : "He only is advancing in life whose heart is getting softer, whose blood warmer, whose brain quicker; whose spirit is entering into living peace." He made the public of his day realise how art was no mere toy but a thing necessary to make life human. He helped to revive in England an appreciation of the various forms of the art and architecture of the past. The exquisite irony with which he describes the kind of architecture expressing the religion of the Victorians,—the votaries of the Goddess of Getting-on,—is hard to match in any other writer. The ruthless attack which he launched on the capitalists in all the three lectures contained in the book, the golden wisdom of his reflections on taste, work, power, kingship, womanhood and war and the picturesque and powerful language in which these are couched,—all these go to prove that the strength of Ruskin's teachings in *The Crown of Wild Olive* will last as long as the world has not out grown its wars or the evils of its own industrial system.

The Crown of Wild Olive is, no doubt, an intensely ethical book. Ruskin stands forth definitely as a teacher and a prophet rather than as a thinker and critic. All the other qualities of Ruskin—his aesthetic sensitiveness, his analytic subtlety, his mystical apprehension of life and his marvellous

command of language—are pressed into service in order to preserve the effiacy of his teaching not only for his own generation but for all time. This is what Carlyle did in *Sartor Resartus*, Newman in his *The Idea of a University Defined*, and Matthew Arnold in *Culture and Anarchy.* The power of their teachings is such that their works will not be forgotten till human society has transfigured itself and risen in renewed splendour like the phoenix from its ashes.

PREFACE

TWENTY years ago, there was no lovelier piece of lowland scenery in South England, nor any more pathetic, in the world, by its expression of sweet human character and life, than that immediately bordering on the sources of the Wandle, and including the lower moors of Addington, and the villages of Beddington and Carshalton, with all their pools and streams. No clearer or diviner waters ever sang with constant lips of the hand which "giveth rain from heaven;" no pastures ever lightened in spring time with more passionate blossoming; no sweeter homes ever hallowed the heart of the passer-by with their pride of peaceful gladness—fain-hidden—yet full-confessed. The place remains, or, until a few months ago, remained, nearly unchanged in its larger features; but, with deliberate mind I say, that I have never seen anything so ghastly in its inner tragic meaning,—not in Pisan Maremma,—not by Campagna tomb,—not by the sand-isles of the Torcellan shore,—as the slow stealing of aspects of reckless, indolent, animal neglect, over the delicate sweetness of that English scene: nor is any blasphemy or impiety—any frantic saying or godless thought—more appalling to me, using the best power of judgment I have to discern its sense and scope, than the insolent defiling of those springs by the human herds that drink of them. Just where the welling of stainless water, trembling

The lowland scenery near the sources of the Wandle in South England was beautiful twenty years ago. But that scenery has now been defiled by reckless and indolent neglect.

and pure, like a body of light, enters the pool of Carshalton, cutting itself a radiant channel down to the gravel, through warp of feathery weeds, all waving, which it traverses with its deep threads of clearness, like the chalcedony in moss-agate, starred here and there with the white grenouillette ; just in the very rush and murmur of the first spreading currents, the human wretches of the place cast their street and house foulness ; heaps of dust and slime, and broken shreds of old metal, and rags of putrid clothes ; they having neither energy to cart it away, nor decency enough to dig it into the ground, thus shed into the stream, to diffuse what venom of it will float and melt, far away, in all places where God meant those waters to bring joy and health. And, in a little pool, behind some houses farther in the village, where another spring rises, the shattered stones of the well, and of the little fretted channel which was long ago built and traced for it by gentler hands, lie scattered, each from each, under a ragged bank of mortar, and scoria ; and bricklayers' refuse, on one side, which the clean water nevertheless chastises to purity ; but it cannot conquer the dead earth beyond ; and there, circled and coiled under festering scum, the stagnant edge of the pool effaces itself into a slope of black slime, the accumulation of indolent years. Half-a-dozen men, with one day's work, could cleanse those pools, and trim the flowers about their banks, and make every breath of summer air above them rich with cool balm ; and every glittering wave medicinal, as if it ran, troubled

of angels, from the porch of Bethesda. But that day's work is never given, nor will be; nor will any joy be possible to heart of man, for evermore, about those wells of English waters.

The new public house in the back streets of Croydon had, below its windows, a recess fenced from the street-pavement by an iron-railing. The only use of the railing was to make that recess a receptacle of refuse. Thus labour is used to defile ground instead of redeeming it.

When I last left them, I walked up slowly through the back streets of Croydon, from the old church to the hospital; and, just on the left, before coming up to the crossing of the High Street, there was a new public-house built. And the front of it was built in so wise manner, that a recess of two feet was left below its front windows, between them and the street-pavement—a recess too narrow for any possible use, (for even if it had been occupied by a seat, as in old time it might have been, everybody walking along the street would have fallen over the legs of the reposing wayfarers). But, by way of making this two feet depth of freehold land more expressive of the dignity of an establishment for the sale of spirituous liquors, it was fenced from the pavement by an imposing iron railing, having four or five spear-heads to the yard of it, and six feet high; containing as much iron and iron-work, indeed, as could well be put into the space; and by this stately arrangement, the little piece of dead ground within, between wall and street, became a protective receptacle of refuse; cigar ends, and oyster shells, and the like, such as an open-handed English street-populace habitually scatters from its presence, and was thus left, unsweepable by any ordinary methods. Now the iron bars which, uselessly, (or in great degree worse than uselessly) enclosed this bit of

ground, and made it pestilent, represented a quantity of work which would have cleansed the Carshalton pools three times over ;—of work, partly cramped and deadly, in the mine ; partly fierce* and exhaustive, at the furnace ; partly foolish and sedentary, of ill-taught students making bad designs : work from the beginning to the last fruits of it, and in all the branches of it, venomous, deathful, and miserable. Now, how did it come to pass that this work was done instead of the other ; that the strength and life of the English operative were spent in defiling ground, instead of redeeming it ; and in producing an entirely (in that place) valueless piece of metal, which can neither be eaten nor breathed, instead of medicinal fresh air, and pure water ?

There is but one reason for it, and at present a conclusive one,—that the capitalist can

* "A fearful occurrence took place a few days since, near Wolverhampton. Thomas Snape, aged nineteen, was on duty as the 'keeper' of a blast furnace at Deepfield, assisted by John Gardner, aged eighteen, and Joseph Swift, aged thirty-seven. The furnace contained four tons of molten iron, and an equal amount of cinders, and ought to have been run out at 7-30 P.M. But Snape and his mates, engaged in talking and drinking, neglected their duty, and, in the meantime, the iron rose in the furnace until it reached a pipe wherein water was contained. Just as the men had stripped, and were proceeding to tap the furnace, the water in the pipe, converted into steam, burst down its front and let loose on them the molten metal, which instantaneously consumed Gardner ; Snape, terribly burnt, and mad with pain, leaped into the canal and then ran home and fell dead on the threshold ; Swift survived to reach the hospital, where he died too."

charge per-centage on the work in the one case, and cannot in the other. If, having certain funds for supporting labour at my disposal, I pay men merely to keep my ground in order, my money is, in that function, spent once for all; but if I pay them to dig iron out of my ground, and work it, and sell it, I can charge rent for the ground' and percentage both on the manufacture and the sale, and make my capital profitable in these three bye-ways The greater part of the profitable investment of capital, in the present day, is in operations of this kind, in which the public is persuaded to buy something of no use to it, on production, or sale, of which, the capitalist may charge per-centage; the said public remaining all the while under the persuasion that the per-centages thus obtained are real national gains, whereas, they are merely filchings out of partially light pickets, to swell heavy ones.

The reason for this is that the capitalist can charge percentage on digging iron out of the ground but not on keeping the ground in order.

Thus, the Croydon publican buys the iron railing, to make himself more conspicuous to drunkards. The public housekeeper on the other side of the way presently buys another railing, to out-rail him with. Both are, as to their *relative* attractiveness to customers of taste, just where they were before; but they have lost the price of the railings; which they must either themselves finally lose, or make their aforesaid customers of taste pay, by raising the price of their beer, or adulterating it. Either the publicans, or their customers, are thus poorer by precisely what the capitalist has grained; and the value of the work itself, meantime, has been lost to the nation; the iron bars

Thus either the publicans or their customers are poorer by what the capitalist has gained. This is the modern equivalent of black-mail. Only, we have substituted cheating for open robbery.

in that form and place being wholly useless. It is this mode of taxation of the poor by the rich which is referred to in the text (page 32), in comparing the modern acquisitive power of capital with that of the lance and sword; the only difference being that the levy of black mail in old times was by force, and is now by cozening. The old rider and reiver frankly quartered himself on the publican for the night;—the modern one merely makes his lance into an iron spike, and persuades his host to buy it. One comes as an open robber, the other as a cheating pedlar; but the result, to the injured person's pocket, is absolutely the same. Of course many useful industries mingle with, and disguise the useless ones; and in the habits of energy aroused by the struggle, there is a certain direct good. It is far better to spend four thousand pounds in making a good gun, and then to blow it to pieces, than to pass life in idleness. Only do not let it be called "political economy." There is also a confused notion in the minds of many persons, that the gathering of the property of the poor into the hands of the rich does no ultimate harm; since, in whosesoever hands it may be, it must be spent at last, and thus, they think, return to the poor again. This fallacy has been again and again exposed; but grant the plea true, and the same apology may, of course, be made for black mail, or any other form of robbery. It might be (though practically it never is) as advantageous for the nation that the robber should have the spending of the money he extorts, as that the person robbed should have spent it. But this is no excuse for

That the gathering of the property of the poor into the hands of the rich does no harm, is a fallacy. It matters little what a labourer is paid. But it matters fearfully whether he is compelled to destroy food or to make it.

the theft. If I were to put a turnpike on the road where it passes my own gate, and endeavour to exact a shilling from every passenger, the public would soon do away with my gate, without listening to any plea on my part that "it was as advantageous to them, in the end, that I should spend their shillings, as that they themselves should." But if, instead of outfacing them with a turnpike, I can only persuade them to come in and buy stones, or old iron, or any other useless thing, out of my ground, I may rob them to the same extent, and be, moreover, thanked as a public benefactor, and promoter of commercial prosperity. And this main question for the poor of England—for the poor of all countries—is wholly omitted in every common treatise on the subject of wealth. Even by the labourers themselves, the operation of capital is regarded only in its effect on their immediate interests; never in the far more terrific power of its appointment of the kind and the object of labour. It matters little, ultimately, how much a labourer is paid for making anything; but it matters fearfully what the thing is, which he is compelled to make If his labour is so ordered as to produce food, and fresh air, and fresh water, no matter that his wages are low,—the food and fresh air and water will be at last there; and he will at last get them. But if he is paid to destroy food and fresh air, or produce iron bars instead of them,—the food and air will finally *not* be there, and he will *not* get them, to his great and final inconvenience. So that, conclusively, in political as in household economy, the great question is, not so much

what money you have in your pocket, as what you will buy with it, and do with it.

There are two difficulties in addressing the English public. (a) They cannot be made to understand that Business is not always good and that its worth depends on its result. (b) One does not know what according to them is the ultimate meaning of the business they are carrying on.

I have been long accustomed, as all men engaged in work of investigation must be, to hear my statements laughed at for years, before they are examined or believed; and I am generally content to wait the public's time. But it has not been without displeased surprise that I have found myself totally unable, as yet, by any repetition, or illustration, to force this plain thought into my readers' heads,—that the wealth of nations, as of men, consists in substance, not in ciphers; and that the real good of all work, and of all commerce, depends on the final worth of the thing you make, or get by it. This is a practical enough statement, one would think: but the English public has been so possessed by its modern school of economists with the notion that Business is always good, whether it be busy in mischief or in benefit; and that buying and selling are always salutary, whatever the intrinsic worth of what you buy or sell, —that it seems impossible to gain so much as a patient hearing for any inquiry respecting the substantial result of our eager modern labours. I have never felt more checked by the sense of this impossibility than in arranging the heads of the following three lectures, which though delivered at considerable intervals of time, and in different places, were not prepared without reference to each other. Their connection would, however, have been made far more distinct, if I had not been prevented, by what I feel to be another great difficulty in addressing English audiences, from enforcing, with

any decision, the common, and to me the most important, part of their subjects. I chiefly desired (as I have just said) to question my hearers—operatives, merchants, and soldiers, as to the ultimate meaning of the *business* they had in hand; and to know from them what they expected or intended their manufacture to come to, their selling to come to, and their killing to come to. That appeared the first point needing determination before I could speak to them with any real utility or effect. "You craftsmen—salesmen—swordsmen,—do but tell me clearly what you want; then, if I can say anything to help you, I will; and if not, I will account to you as I best may for my inability" But in order to put this question into any terms, one had first of all to face the difficulty just spoken of—to me for the present insuperable,—the difficulty of knowing whether to address one's audience as believing, or not believing, in any other world than this. For if you address any average modern English company as believing in an Eternal life, and endeavour to draw any conclusions, from this assumed belief, as to their present business, they will forthwith tell you that "what you say is very beautiful, but it is not practical." If, on the contrary, you frankly address them as unbelievers in Eternal life, and try to draw any consequences from that unbelief,—they immediately hold you for an accursed person, and shake off the dust from their feet at you. And the more I thought over what I had got to say, the less I found I could say it, without some reference to this intangible or intractable

This latter cannot be brought home to them unless you know whether the worker, the merchant and the soldier believe in any other world than this or not. Hence the reader will find a pausing short of conclusions in these lectures.

part of the subject. It made all the difference, in asserting any principle of war, whether one assumed that a discharge of artillery would merely knead down a certain quantity of red clay into a level line, as in a brick-field ; or whether, out of every separately Christian-named portion of the ruinous heap, there went out, into the smoke and dead-fallen air of battle, some astonished condition of soul, unwillingly released. It made all the difference, in speaking of the possible range of commerce, whether one assumed that all bargains related only to visible property—or whether property, for the present invisible, but nevertheless real, was elsewhere purchasable on other terms. It made all the difference, in addressing a body of men subject to considerable hardship, and having to find some way out of it—whether one could confidently say to them. "My friends,—you have only to die, and all will be right ;" or whether one had any secret misgiving that such advice was more blessed to him that gave, than to him that took it. And therefore the deliberate reader will find, throughout these lectures, a hesitation in driving points home, and a pausing short of conclusions which he will feel I would fain have come to ; hesitation which arises wholly from this uncertainty of my hearers' temper. For I do not now speak, nor have I ever spoken, since the time of first forward youth, in any proselyting temper, as desiring to persuade any one of what, in such matters, I thought myself ; but, whomsoever I venture to address, I take for the time his creed as I find it ; and endeavour to push it into such

vital fruit as it seems capable of. Thus, it is a creed with a great part of the existing English people, that they are in possession of a book which tells them, straight from the lips of God, all they ought to do, and need to know. I have read that book, with as much care as most of them, for some forty years; and am thankful that, on those who trust it, I can press its pleadings. My endeavour has been uniformly to make them trust it more deeply than they do; trust it, not in their own favourite verses only, but in the sum of all; trust it, not as a fetish or talisman, which they are to be saved by daily repetitions of; but as a Captain's order, to be heard and obeyed at their peril. I was always encouraged by supposing my hearers to hold such belief. To these, if to any, I once had hope of addressing, with acceptance, words which insisted on the guilt of pride, and the futility of avarice; from these, if from any, I once expected ratification of a political economy, which asserted that the life was more than the meat, and the body than raiment; and these, it once seemed to me, I might ask, without accusation of fanaticism, not merely in doctrine of the lips, but in the bestowal of their heart's treasure, to separate themselves from the crowd of whom it is written, "After all these things do the Gentiles seek."

I thought for sometime that the majority of us believed in the Bible and I based my conclusions on that assumption.

It cannot, however, be assumed, with any semblance of reason, that a general audience is now wholly, or even in majority, composed of these religious persons. A large portion must always consist of men who admit no such creed; or who, at least, are inaccessible to

But there will always be numerous unbelievers. Men must now declare themselves to be either Christians or Infidels. We

might order our conduct wisely according to either faith.

appeals founded on it. And as, with the so-called Christian, I desired to plead for honest declaration and fulfilment of his belief in life.—with the so-called Infidel, I desired to plead for an honest declaration and fulfilment of his belief in death. The dilemma is inevitable. Men must either hereafter live, or hereafter die; fate may be bravely met, and conduct wisely ordered, on either expectation; but never in hesitation between ungrasped hope, and unconfronted fear. We usually believe in immortality, so far as to avoid preparation for death; and in mortality, so far as to avoid preparation for anything after death. Whereas, a wise man will at least hold himself prepared for one or other of two events, of which one or other is inevitable; and will have all things in order, for his sleep, or in readiness, for his awakening.

Disbelief in the immortality of the soul seems to be more usual than belief in it. Nor is it consistent with purity of character or energy of hand. A Christian is not necessarily nobler than an Infidel.

Nor have we any right to call it an ignoble judgment, if he determine to put them in order, as for sleep. A brave belief in life is indeed an enviable state of mind, but as far as I can discern, an unusual one. I know few Christians so convinced of the splendour of the rooms in their Father's house, as to be happier when their friends are called to those mansions, than they would have been if the Queen had sent for them to live at court: nor has the Church's most ardent "desire to depart, and be with Christ," ever cured it of the singular habit of putting on mourning for every person summoned to such departure. On the contrary, a brave belief in death has been assuredly held by many not ignoble persons, and it is a sign of the last depravity in the Church itself, when it assumes

that such a belief is inconsistent with either purity of character, or energy of hand. The shortness of life is not, to any rational person, a conclusive reason for wasting the space of it which may be granted him ; nor does the anticipation of death to-morrow suggest, to any one but a drunkard, the expediency of drunkenness to-day. To teach that there is no device in the grave, may indeed make the deviceless person more contented in his dulness ; but it will make the deviser only more earnest in devising: nor is human conduct likely, in every case, to be purer, under the conviction that all its evil may in a moment be pardoned, and all its wrong-doing in a moment redeemed ; and that the sigh of repentance, which purges the guilt of the past, will waft the soul into a felicity which forgets its pain,—than it may be under the sterner, and to many not unwise minds, more probable, apprehension, that "what a man soweth that shall he also reap"—or others reap,—when he, the living seed of pestilence, walketh no more in darkness, but lies down therein.

But to men whose feebleness of sight, or bitterness of soul, or the offence given by the conduct of those who claim higher hope, may have rendered this painful creed the only possible one, there is an appeal to be made, more secure in its ground than any which can be addressed to happier persons. I would fain, if I might offencelessly, have spoken to them as if none others heard ; and have said thus : Hear me, you dying men, who will soon be deaf for ever. For these others at your right hand and

But it is all the more necessary for unbelievers to be kind and just to the poor,—for they may never get a chance again to make amends for their wanton behaviour. They can, like the heathen, find their happiness only in kindly and fruitful peace and not in wealth, war or tyranny.

your left, who look forward to a state of infinite existence, in which all their errors will be overruled, and all their faults forgiven ; for these, who, stained and blackened in the battle smoke of mortality, have but to dip themselves for an instant in the font of death, and to rise renewed of plumage, as a dove that is covered with silver, and her feathers like gold ; for these, indeed, it may be permissible to waste their numbered moments, through faith in a future of innumerable hours ; to these, in their weakness it may be conceded that they should tamper with sin which can only bring forth fruit of righteousness, and profit by the iniquity which, one day, will be remembered no more. In them, it may be no sign of hardness of heart to neglect the poor, over whom they know their Master is watching ; and to leave those to perish temporarily, who cannot perish eternally. But, for you, there is no such hope, and therefore no such excuse. This fate, which you ordain for the wretched, you believe to be all their inheritance; you may crush them, before the moth, and they will never rise to rebuke you ; -their breath, which fails for lack of food, once expiring, will never be recalled to whisper against you a word of accusing ;—they and you, as you think, shall lie down together in the dust, and the worms cover you ;—and for them there shall be no consolation, and on you no vengeance,—only the question murmured above your grave : "Who shall repay him what he hath done ?" It is therefore easier for you in your heart to inflict the sorrow for which there is no remedy ? Will you take, wantonly, this little all of his life from your poor brother, and make

his brief hours long to him with pain? Will you be readier to the injustice which can never be redressed; and niggardly of mercy which you *can* bestow but once, and which, refusing, you refuse for ever? I think better of you, even of the most selfish, than that you would do this, well understood. And for yourselves, it seems to me, the question becomes not less grave, in these curt limits. If your life were but a fever fit;—the madness of a night, whose follies were all to be forgotten in the dawn, it might matter little how you fretted away the sickly hours,—what toys you snatched at, or let fall,—what visions you followed wistfully with the deceived eyes of sleepless phrenzy. Is the earth only an hospital? Play, if you care to play, on the floor of the hospital dens. Knit its straw into what crowns please you; gather the dust of it for treasure, and die rich in that, clutching at the black motes in the air with your dying hands;—and yet, it may be well with you. But if this life be no dream, and the world no hospital; if all the peace and power and joy you can ever win, must be won now; and all fruit of victory gathered here, or never,—will you still, throughout the puny totality of your life, weary yourselves in the fire for vanity? If there is no rest which remaineth for you, is there none you might presently take? was this grass of the earth made green for your shroud only, not for your bed? And can you never lie down *upon* it, but only *under* it? The heathen, to whose creed you have returned, thought not so. They knew that life brought its contest: but they expected from it

also the crown of all contest: No proud one! no jewelled circlet flaming through Heaven above the height of the unmerited throne ; only some few leaves of wild olive, cool to the tired brow, through a few years of peace. It should have been of gold, they thought ; but Jupiter was poor ; this was the best the god could give them. Seeking a greater than this, they had known it a mockery Not in war, not in wealth, not in tyranny, was there any happiness to be found for them—only in kindly peace, fruitful and free. The wreath was to be of *wild* olive, mark you :—the tree that grows carelessly, tufting the rocks with no vivid bloom, no verdure of branch ; only with soft snow of blossom, and scarcely fulfilled fruit, mixed with grey leaf and thorn-set stem ; no fastening of diadem for you but with such sharp embriodery ! But this, such as it is, you may win while yet you live ; type of gray honour and sweet rest. Free-heartedness, and graciousness, and undisturbed trust, and requited love, and the sight of the peace of others, and the ministry to their pain ;—these, and the blue sky above you, and the sweet waters and flowers of the earth beneath ; and mysteries and presences, innumerable, of living things—these may yet be here your riches ; untormenting and divine : serviceable for the life that now is ; nor it may be without promise of that which is to come.

LECTURE I

WORK

(Delivered before the Working Men's Institute, at Camberwell.)

The basis of class-distinction: its past, present and future.

My Friends,—I have not come among you to-night to endeavour to give you an entertaining lecture; but to tell you a few plain facts, and ask you some plain, but necessary, questions. I have seen and known too much of the struggle for life among our labouring population, to feel at ease, even under any circumstances, in inviting them to dwell on the trivialities of my own studies; but, much more, as I meet to-night, for the first time, the members of a working Institute established in the district in which I have passed the greater part of my life, I am desirous that we should at once understand each other, on graver matters. I would fain tell you, with what feelings, and with what hope, I regard this Institution, as one of many such, now happily established throughout England, as well as in other countries;—Institutions which are preparing the way for a great change in all the circumstances of industrial life; but of which the success must wholly depend upon our clearly understanding the circumstances and necessary *limits* of this change. No teacher can truly promote the cause of education, until he knows the conditions of the life for which that education is to prepare his pupil. And

the fact that he is called upon to address you, nominally, as a "Working Class," must compel him, if he is in any wise earnest or thoughtful, to enquire in the outset, on what you yourselves suppose this class distinction has been founded in the past, and must be founded in the future. The manner of the amusement, and the matter of the teaching, which any of us can offer you, must depend wholly on our first understanding from you, whether you think the distinction heretofore drawn between working men and others, is truly or falsely founded. Do you accept it as it stands? do you wish it to be modified? or do you think the object of education is to efface it, and make us forget it for ever?

Classes,-upper and ower : idle men and working men.

Let me make myself more distinctly understood. We call this—you and I—a "Working Men's" Institute, and our college in London, a "Working Men's" College. Now, how do you consider that these several institutes differ or ought to differ, from "idle men's" insitutes and "idle men's" colleges? Or by what other word than "idle" shall I distinguish those whom the happiest and wisest of working men do not object to call the "Upper Classes"? Are there really upper classes,—are there lower? How much should they always be elevated, how much always depressed? And, gentlemen and ladies—I pray those of you who are here to forgive me the offence there may be in what I am going to say. It is not I who wish to say it. Bitter voices say it; voices of battle and of famine through all the world, which must be heard some day, whoever

keeps silence. Neither is it to *you* specially that I say it. I am sure that most now present know their duties of kindness, and fulfil them, better perhaps than I do mine. But I speak to you as representing your whole class, which errs, I know, chiefly by thoughtlessness. but not therefore the less terribly. Wilful error is limited by the will, but what limit is there to that of which we are unconscious ?

The indolence of the upper classes: but not all rich men are idle.

Bear with me, therefore, while I turn to these workmen, and ask them, also as representing a great multitude, what they think the "upper classes" are, and ought to be, in relation to them Answer, you workmen who are here, as you would among yourselves, frankly; and tell me how you would have me call those classes. Am I to call them—would *you* think me right in calling them—the idle classes ? I think you would feel somewhat uneasy, and as if I were not treating my subject honestly, or speaking from my heart, if I went on under the supposition that all rich people were idle. You would be both unjust and unwise if you allowed me to say that ;—not less unjust than the rich people who say that all the poor are idle, and will never work if they can help it, or more than they can help.

Idleness is a human weakness common to both the classes. But each class has a tendency to look only for the faults of the other.

For indeed the fact is, that there are idle poor and idle rich; and there are busy poor and busy rich. Many a beggar is as lazy as if he had ten thousand a year ; and many a man of large fortune is busier than his errand-boy, and never would think of stopping in the street to play marbles So that, in a large view, the

distinction between workers and idlers, as between knaves and honest men, runs through the very heart and innermost economies of men of all ranks and in all positions. There is a working class—strong and happy,—among both rich and poor; there is an idle class—meak, wicked, and miserable,—among both rich and poor And the worst of the misunderstandings arising between the two orders come of the unlucky fact that the wise of one class habitually contemplate the foolish of the other. If the busy rich people watched and rebuked the idle rich people, all would be right: and if the busy poor people, watched and rebuked the idle poor people, all would be right. But each class has a tendency to look for the faults of the other. A hard-working man of property is particularly offended by an idle beggar; and an orderly, but poor, workman is naturally intolerant of the licentious luxury of the rich. And what is severe judgment in the minds of the just men of either class, becomes fierce enmity in the unjust—but among the unjust *only*. None but the dissolute among the poor look upon the rich as their natural enemies, or desire to pillage their houses and divide their property. None but the dissolute among the rich speak in opprobrious terms of the vices and follies of the poor.

We shall consider only the industrious of both classes to-night.

There is, then, no class distinction between idle and industrious people; and I am going to-night to speak only of the industrious. The idle people we will put out of our thoughts at once—they are mere nuisances—what ought to be done with *them*, we'll talk of at another time. But there are class distinctions among

the industrious themselves;—tremendous distinctions, which rise and fall to every degree in the infinite thermometer of human pain and of human power,—distinctions of high and low, of lost and won, to the whole reach of man's soul and body.

These separations we will study, and the laws of them, among energetic men only, who, whether they work or whether they play, put their strength into the work, and their strength into the game; being in the full sense of the word "industrious," one way or another,—with purpose, or without. And these distinctions are mainly four:

There are four class-distinctions among the industrious themselves.

I. Between those who work, and those who play.

II. Between those who produce the means of life, and those who consume them.

III. Between those who work with the head, and those who work with the hand.

IV. Between those who work wisely, and those who work foolishly.

For easier memory, let us say we are going to oppose, in our examination,—

I. Work to play;
II. Production to consumption;
III. Head to hand; and,
IV. Sense to nonsense.

I.—First, then, of the distinction between the classes who work and the classes who play Of course we must agree upon a definition of these terms,—work and play,—before going farther. Now, roughly, not with vain subtlety of definition, but for plain use of the words, "play" is an exertion of body or mind, made

(1) Work and play: the classes who work and the classes who play. Work is an exertion of body or mind made with a determined end.

Play is a similar exertion made only to please ourselves.

to please ourselves, and with no determined end ; and work is a thing done because it ought to be done, and with a determined end. You play, as you call it, at cricket, for instance. That is as hard work as anything else ; but it amuses you, and it has no result but the amusement. If it were done as an ordered form of exercise, for health's sake, it would become work directly. So, in like manner, whatever we do to please ourselves, and only for the sake of the pleasure, not for an ultimate object, is "play," the "pleasing thing," not the useful thing. Play may be useful, in a secondary sense ; (nothing is indeed more useful or necessary) ; but the use of it depends on its being spontaneous.

The playing class in England play at several games. One of them is (a) the game of money-making. It is played only with the object of having money and more money.

Let us, then ; enquire together what sort of games the playing class in England spend their lives in playing at.

The first of all English games is making money. That is an all-absorbing game ; and we knock eath other down oftener in playing at that, than at football, or any other roughest sport : and it is absolutely without purpose; no one who engages heartily in that game ever knows why. Ask a great money-maker what he wants to do with his money.—he never knows. He doesn't make it to do anything with it. He gets it only that he *may* get it. "What will you make of what you have got?" you ask. "Well, I'll get more," he says. Just as, at cricket, you get more runs. There's no use in the runs, but to get more of them than other people is the game. And there's no use in the money, but to have more of it than other people is the game.

So all that great foul city of London there,—rattling, growling, smoking, stinking,—a ghastly heap of fermenting brickwork, pouring out poison at every pore,—you fancy it is a city of work ? Not a street of it ! It is a great city of play ; very nasty play, and very hard play, but still play. It is only Lord's cricket ground without the turf:—a huge billiard table without the cloth, and with pockets as deep as the bottomless pit, but mainly a billiard table, after all.

This game appears always to produce money. But it is only by fleecing another that the money-maker fills his pockets.

Well, the first great English game is this playing at counters. It differs from the rest in that it appears always to be producing money, while every other game is expensive. But it does not always produce money. There's a great difference between "winning" money and "making" it : a great difference between getting it out of another man's pocket into ours, or filling both. Collecting money is by no means the same thing as making it ; the tax-gatherer's house is not the Mint ; and much of the apparent gain, (so called), in commerce, is only a form of taxation on carriage or exchange.

(b) The game of hunting and shooting : this is not only a useless but a deadly game.

Our next great English game, however, hunting and shooting, is costly altogether ; and how much we are fined for it annually in land, horses, gamekeepers, and game laws, and all else that accompanies that beautiful and special English game, I will not endeavour to count now; but note only that, except for exercise, this is not merely a useless game, but a deadly one, to all connected with it. For through horse-racing, you get every form of what the higher

classes everywhere call "Play," in distinction from all other plays; that is,—gambling; by no means a beneficial or recreative game; and, through game-preserving, you get also some curious laying out of ground; that beautiful arrangement of dwelling-house for man and beast, by which we have grouse and black-cock —so many brace to the acre, and men and women—so many brace to the garret. I often wonder what the angelic builders and surveyors —the angelic builders who build the "many mansions" up above there; and the angelic surveyors, who measured that four-square city with their measuring reeds—I wonder what they think, or are supposed to think, of the laying out of ground by this nation, which has set itself, as it seems, literally to accomplish, word for word, or rather fact for word, in the persons of those poor whom its Master left to represent him, what that Master said of himself—that foxes and birds had homes, but He none.

(c) The game of dressing: this is a ladies' game. It would be a nice one if only they helped everybody to dress nicely.

Then, next to the gentlemen's game of hunting, we must put the ladies' game of dressing. It is not the cheapest of games. I saw a brooch at a jeweller's in Bond Street a fortnight ago, not an inch wide, and without any singular jewel in it, yet worth £ 3000. And I wish I could tell you what this "play" costs, altogether, in England, France, and Russia annually. But it is a pretty game, and on certain terms, I like it; nay, I don't see it played quite as much as I would fain have it. You ladies like to lead the fashion;—by all means lead it—lead it thoroughly, lead it far enough. Dress your-

selves nicely, and dress everybody else nicely. Lead the *fashions for the poor* first; make *them* look well, and you yourselves will look, in ways of which you have now no conception, all the better. The fashions you have set for some time among your peasantry are not pretty ones; their doublets are too irregularly slashed, and the wind blows too frankly through them.

Then there are other games, wild enough, as I could show you if I had time.

There's playing at literature, and playing at art—very different, both, from working at literature, or working at art, but I've no time to speak of these. I pass to the greatest of all —the play of plays, the great gentleman's game, which ladies like them best to play at,— the game of War. It is entrancingly pleasant to the imagination; the facts of it, not always so pleasant. We dress for it, however, more finely than for any other sport; and go out to it, not merely in scarlet as to hunt, but in scarlet and gold, and all manner of fine colours; of course we could fight better in grey, and without feathers, but all nations have agreed that it is good to be well dressed at this play. Then the bats and balls are very costly; our English and French bats, with the balls and wickets, even those which we don't make any use of, costing, I suppose, now about fifteen millions of money annually to each nation; all which you know is paid for by hard labourer's work in the furrow and furnace. A costly game!—not to speak of its consequences; I will say at present nothing of these. The mere immediate cost of all these plays is what I

(d) The game of war; this is the "great gentleman's game" costing deadly work, bringing misery into the heart of the country and producing calamitous consequences.

want you to consider; they all cost deadly work somewhere, as many of us know too well. The jewel-cutter, whose sight fails over the diamonds; the weaver, whose arm fails over the web; the iron-forger, whose breath fails before the furnace—*they* know what work is—they, who have all the work, and none of the play, except a kind they have named for themselves down in the black north country, where "play" means being laid up by sickness. It is a pretty example for philologists, of varying dialect, this change, in the sense of the word play, as used in the black country of Birmingham, and the red and black country of Baden Baden. Yes, gentlemen, and gentlewomen, of England, who think "one moment unamused a misery, not made for feeble man," this is what you have brought the word "play" to mean, in the heart of merry England! You may have your fluting and piping; but there are sad children sitting in the market-place, who indeed cannot say to you, "We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced:" but eternally shall say to you, "We have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented."

Play sustained by the work of others is a crime. Men who realise this will all be workers. And class-distinction will be forgotten to that extent at least.

This, then, is the first distinction between the "upper and lower" classes. And this is one which is by no means necessary; which indeed must, in process of good time, be by all honest men's consent abolished. Men will be taught that an existence of play, sustained by the blood of other creatures, is a good existence for gnats and sucking fish; but not for men: that neither days, nor lives, can be made holy by doing nothing in them: that the best prayer

at the beginning of a day is that we may not lose its moments; and the best grace before meat, the consciousness that we have justly earned our dinner. And when we have this much of plain Christianity preached to us again, and enough respect what we regard as inspiration, as not to think that "Son, go work to-day in my vineyard," means "Fool, go play to-day in my vineyard," we shall be workers, in one way or another; and this much at least of the distinction between "upper" and "lower" forgotten.

(2) Production and consumption: the classes who produce the means of life and those who consume them.

II. I pass then to our second distinction; between the rich and poor, between Dives and Lazarus,—distinction which exists more sternly, I suppose, in this day, than ever in the world, Pagan or Christian, till now. I will put it sharply before you, to begin with, merely by reading two paragraphs which I cut from two papers that lay on my breakfast table on the same morning, the 25th of November, 1864. The piece about the rich Russian at Paris is common-place enough, and stupid besides; (for fifteen francs – 12s. 6d , – is nothing for a rich man to give for a couple of peaches, out of season). still, the two paragraphs printed on the same day are worth putting side by side.

The distinction is brought home by the paragraph about the rich Russian.

"Such a man is now here. He is a Russian, and, with your permission, we will call him Count Teufelskine. In dress he is sublime; art is considered in that toilet, the harmony of colour respected, the *chiaroscuro* evident in well-selected contrast In manners he is dignified—nay, perhaps apathetic; nothing disturbs the placid serenity of that calm exterior. One

day our friend breakfasted *chez* Bignon. When the bill came he read, 'Two peaches, 15f.' He paid. 'Peaches scarce, I presume?' was his sole remark. 'No, sir,' replied the waiter, 'but Teufelskines are.' "—*Telegraph*, November 25, 1864.

and the man dead on the dung heap.

"Yesterday morning, at eight o'clock, a woman passing a dung heap in the stone yard near the recently erected alms-houses in Shadwell Gap, High Street, Shadwell, called the attention of a Thames police-constable to a man in a sitting position on the dung heap, and said she was afraid he was dead. Her fears proved to be true. The wretched creature appeared to have been dead several hours. He had perished of cold and wet, and the rain had been beating down on him all night. The deceased was a bone-picker. He was in the lowest stage of poverty, poorly clad, and half-starved. The police had frequently driven him away from the stone yard, between sunset and sunrise, and told him to go home. He selected a most desolate spot for his wretched death. A penny and some bones were found in his pockets. The deceased was between fifty and sixty years of age. Inspector Roberts, of the K division, has given directions for inquiries to be made at the lodging-houses respecting the deceased, to ascertain his identity if possible."—*Morning Post*, November 25, 1864.

who could not even suck enough marrow from bones.

You have the separation thus in brief compass; and I want you to take notice of the "a penny and some bones were found in his pockets," and to compare it with this third

statement, from the *Telegraph* of January 16th of this year:—

"Again, the dietary scale for adult and juvenile paupers was drawn up by the most conspicuous political economists in England. It is low in quantity, but it is sufficient to support nature; yet within ten years of the passing of the Poor Law Act, we heard of the paupers in the Andover Union gnawing the scraps of putrid flesh and sucking the marrow from the bones of horses which they were employed to crush."

You see my reason for thinking that our Lazarus of Christianity has some advantage over the Jewish one. Jewish Lazarus expected, or at least prayed, to be fed with crumbs from the rich man's table; but *our* Lazarus is fed with crumbs from the dog's table.

The modern world is more cruel than the primitive one.

Now this distinction between rich and poor rests on two bases. Within its proper limits, on a basis which is lawful and everlastingly necessary; beyond them, on a basis unlawful, and everlastingly corrupting the frame-work of society. The lawful basis of wealth is, that a man who works should be paid the fair value of his work; and that if he does not choose to spend it to-day, he should have free leave to keep it, and spend it to-morrow. Thus, an industrious man working daily, and laying by daily, attains at last the possession of an accumulated sum of wealth, to which he has absolute right. The idle person who will not work, and the wasteful person who lays nothing by, at the end of the same will be doubly poor—poor in possession, and dissolute

The lawful basis of class-distinction is that he should keep who has justly earned.

in moral habit; and he will then naturally covet the money which the other has saved. And if he is then allowed to attack the other, and rob him of his well earned wealth, there is no more any motive for saving, or any reward for good conduct; and all society is thereupon dissolved, or exists only in systems of rapine. Therefore the first necessity of social life is the clearness of national conscience in enforcing the law—that he should keep who has JUSTLY EARNED.

The false basis of class-distinction is the power held over those who are earning wealth by those who already possess it and only use it to gain more.

That law, I say, is the proper basis of distinction between rich and poor. But there is also a false basis of distinction; namely, the power held over those who earn wealth by those who levy or exact it. There will be always a number of men who would fain set themselves to the accumulation of wealth as the sole object of their lives. Necessarily, that class of men is an uneducated class, inferior in intellect, and more or less cowardly. It is physically impossible for a well-educated, intellectual, or brave man to make money the chief object of his thoughts; as physically impossible as it is for him to make his dinner the principal object of them. All healthy people like their dinners, but their dinner is not the main object of their lives. So all healthily minded people like making money—ought to like it, and to enjoy the sensation of winning it: but the main object of their life is not money; it is something better than money. A good soldier, for instance, mainly wishes to do his fighting well. He is glad of his pay—very properly so, and justly grumbles when you keep him ten years without it—still,

his main notion of life is to win battles, not to be paid for winning them. So of clergymen. They like pew-rents, and baptismal fees, of course; but yet, if they are brave and well educated, the pew-rent is not the sole object of their lives, and the baptismal fee is not the sole purpose of the baptism; the clergyman's object is essentially to baptise and preach, not to be paid for preaching. So of doctors. They like fees no doubt,—ought to like them; yet if they are brave and well educated, the entire object of their lives is not fees. They, on the whole, desire to cure the sick; and,—if they are good doctors, and the choice were fairly put to them,—would rather cure their patient, and lose their fee, than kill him, and get it. And so with all other brave and rightly trained men; their work is first, their fee second—very important always, but still *second*. But in every nation, as I said, there are a vast class who are ill-educated, cowardly, and more or less stupid. And with these people, just as certainly the fee is first, and the work second, as with brave people the work is first and the fee second. And this is no small distinction. It is the whole distinction in a man; distinction between life and death *in* him, between heaven and hell *for* him. You cannot serve two masters;—you *must* serve one or other. If your work is first with you, and your fee second, work is your master, and the lord of work, who is God. But if your fee is first with you, and your work second, fee is your master, and the lord of fee, who is the Devil; and not only the Devil, but the lowest of devils—the "least

erected fiend that fell." So there you have it in brief terms; Work first—you are God's servants; Fee first—you are the Fiend's. And it makes a difference, now and ever, believe me, whether you serve Him who has on His vesture and thigh written, "King of Kings", and whose service is perfect freedom; or him on whose vesture and thigh the name is written, "Slave of Slaves," and whose service is perfect slavery.

The money-makers are like Judas. They do not care for God because they do not understand Him.

However in every nation there are, and must always be, a certain number of these Fiend's servants, who have it principally for the object of their lives to make money. They are always, as I said, more or less stupid, and cannot conceive of anything else so nice as money. Stupidity is always the basis of the judas bargain We do great injutice to Iscariot, in thinking him wicked above all common wickedness. He was only a common money-lover, and, like all money-lovers, didn't understand Christ;—couldn't make out the worth of Him, or meaning of Him. He didn't want Him to be killed He was horror-stuck when he found that Christ would be killed; threw his money away instantly, and hanged himself. How many of our present money-seekers, think you, would have the grace to hang themselves, whoever was killed? But Judas was a common, selfish, muddle-headed, pilfering fellow; his hand always in the bag of the poor, not caring for them. He didn't understand Christ,—yet believed in Him, much more than most of us do; had seen Him do miracles, thought He was quite strong enough to shift for Himself, and

he, Judas, might as well make his own little bye-perquisites out of the affair. Christ would come out of it well enough, and he have his thirty pieces. Now, that is the money-seeker's idea, all over the world He doesn't hate Christ, but can't understand Him—doesn't care for Him—sees no good to that benevolent business; makes his own little job out of it at all events, come what will. And thus, out of every mass of men, you have a certain number of bagmen—your "fee-first" men, whose main object is to make money. And they do make it—make it in all sorts of unfair ways, chiefly by the weight and force of money itself, or what is called the power of capital; that is to say, the power which money, once obtained, has over the labour of the poor, so that the capitalist can take all its produce to himself, except the labourer's food. That is the modern Judas's way of "carrying the bag," and "bearing what is put therein"

The unjust power of capital: when money is the principal object of life it is both got in and spent ill and becomes the root of all evil.

Nay, but (it is asked) how is that an unfair advantage? Has not the man who has worked for the money a right to use it as he best can? No; in this respect, money is now exactly what mountain promontories over public roads were in old times. The barons fought for them fairly:—the strongest and cunningest got them; then fortified them, and made every one who passed below pay toll. Well, capital now is exactly what crags were then. Men fight fairly (we will, at least, grant so much, though it is more than we ought) for their money: but, once having got it, the fortified millionaire can make everybody who passes below pay toll to

his million, and build another tower of his money castle. And I can tell you, the poor vagrants by the roadside suffer now quite as much from the bag-baron, as ever they did from the crag-baron. Bags and crags have just the same result on rags. I have not time, however, to-night to show you in how many ways the power of capital is unjust; but this one great principle I have to assert—you will find it quite indisputably true—that whenever money is the principal object of life with either man or nation, it is both got ill, and spent ill; and does harm both in the getting and spending; but when it is not the principal object, it and all other things will be well got, and well spent. And here is the test, with every man, of whether money is the principal object with him, or not. If in mid-life he could pause and say, "Now I have enough to live upon, I'll live upon it; and having well earned it, I will also well spend it; and go out of the world poor, as I came into it," then money is not principal with him; but if, having enough to live upon in the manner befitting his character and rank, he still wants to make more, and to *die* rich, then money is the principal object with him, and it becomes a curse to himself, and generally to those who spend it after him. For you know it *must* be spent some day; the only question is whether the man who makes it shall spend it, or some one else. And generally it is better for the maker to spend it, for he will know best its value and use. This is the true law of life. And if a man does not choose thus to spend his money, he must either hoard it or lend it, and the worst thing he can

generally do is to lend it ; for borrowers are nearly always ill-spenders, and it is with lent money that all evil is mainly done, and all unjust war protracted.

The unjust use of capital: all unjust wars and oppressions were protracted by taking loans from foreign governments.

For observe what the real fact is, respecting loans to foreign military governments, and how strange it is. If your little boy came to you to ask for money to spend in squibs and crackers, you would think twice before you gave it him ; and you would have some idea that it was wasted, when you saw it fly off in fireworks, even though he did no mischief with it. But the Russian children, and Austrian children, come to you, borrowing money, not to spend in innocent squibs, but in cartridges and bayonets to attack you in India with, and to keep down all noble life in Italy with, and to murder Polish women and children with ; and *that* you will give at once, because they pay you interest for it. Now, in order to pay you that interest, they must tax every working peasant in their dominions ; and on that work you live. You therefore at once rob the Austrian peasant, assassinate or banish the Polish peasant, and you live on the produce of the theft, and the bribe for the assassination! That is the broad fact—that is the practical meaning of your foreign loans, and of most large interest of money; and then you quarrel with Bishop Colenso, forsooth, as if *he* denied the Bible, and you believed it! though, wretches as you are, every deliberate act of your lives is a new defiance of its primary orders, and as if, for most of the rich men of England at this moment, it were not indeed to be desired, as the best thing at least for

them, that the Bible should *not* be true, since against them these words are written in it: "The rust of your gold and silver shall be a witness against you, and shall eat you flesh, as it were fire."

(3) Head and hand: the classes who work with the head and those who work with the hand. It is no use hiding the sorrowful fact that manual work is ignoble and intellectual work noble.

III. I pass now to our third condition of separation, between the men who work with the hand, and those who work with the head.

And here we have at last an inevitable distinction. There *must* be work done by the arms, or none of us could live. There *must* be work done by the brains, or the life we get would not be worth having. And the same men cannot do both. There is rough work to be done, and rough men must do it; there is gentle work to be done, and gentle men must do it; and it is physically impossible that one class should do, or divide, the work of the other. And it is of no use of try to conceal this sorrowful fact by fine words, and to talk to the workmen about the honourableness of manual labour, and the dignity of humanity. That is a grand old proverb of Sancho Panza's, "Fine words butter no parsnips;" and I can tell you that. all over England just now, you workmen are buying a great deal too much butter at that dairy. Rough work, honourable or not, takes the life out of us; and the man who has been heaving clay out of a ditch all day, or driving an express train against the north wind all night, or holding a collier's helm in a gale on a lee shore, or whirling white-hot iron at a furnace mouth, that man is not the same at the end of his day, or night, as one who has been sitting in a quiet

room, with everything comfortable about him, reading books. or classing butterflies, or painting pictures. If it is any comfort to you to be told that the rough work is the more honourable of the two, I should be sorry to take that much of consolation from you; and in some sense I need not. The rough work is at all events real. honest, and, generally, though not always, useful; while the fine work is, a great deal of it, foolish and false as well as fine, and therefore dishonourable: but when both kinds are equally well and worthily done, the head's is the noble work, and the hand's the ignoble; and of all hand work whatsoever, necessary for the maintenance of life, these old words, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," indicate that the inherent nature of it is one of calamity; and that the ground, cursed for our sake, casts also some shadow of degradation into our contest with its thorn and its thistle; so that all nations have held their days honourable, or "holy," and constituted them "holydays," or "holidays," by making them days of rest; and the promise, which, among all our distant hopes, seems to cast the chief brightness over death, is that blessing of the dead who die in the Lord, that "they rest from their labours, an their works do follow them."

What is to be the future of the working class?

And thus the perpetual question and contest must arise, who is to do this rough work? and how is the worker of it to be comforted, redeemed, and rewarded? and what kind of play should he have, and what rest, in this world, sometimes, as well as in the next? Well, my good working friends, these ques-

tions will take a little time to answer yet. They must be answered: all good men are occupied with them, and all honest thinkers. There's grand head work doing about them; but much must be discovered, and much attempted in vain, before anything decisive can be told you. Only note these few particulars, which are already sure.

Justice in the distribution of hard work: every one should be allowed to do what he thinks he should do. The servant and the master should be resolved to do each other justice. The one Divine work is to do justice. Why should not the little crossing-sweeper have a feather on its head, as well as your own child? It is not Providence but the rich man that is responsible for this inequality.

As to the distribution of the hard work. None of us, or very few of us, do either hard or soft work because we think we ought; but because we have chanced to fall into the way of it, and cannot help ourselves Now, nobody does anything well that they cannot help doing: work is only done well when it is done with a will; and no man has a thoroughly sound will unless he knows he is doing what he should, and is in his place And, depend upon it, all work must be done at last, not in a disorderly, scrambling, doggish way, but in an ordered, soldierly human way—a lawful way. Men are enlisted for the labour that kills—the labour of war: they are counted, trained fed, dressed, and praised for that Let them be enlisted also for the labour that feeds: let them be counted, trained, fed, dressed, praised for that. Teach the plough exercise as carefully as you do the sword exercise, and let the officers of troops of life be held as much gentlemen as the officers of troops of death; and all is done: but neither this, nor any other right thing, can be accomplished—you can't even see your way to it—unless, first of all, both servant and master are resolved that, come what will of it, they will do each other justice. People are

perpetually squabbling about what will be best to do, or easiest to do, or adviseablest to do, or profitablest to do; but they never, so far as I hear them talk, ever ask what it is *just* to do. And it is the law of heaven that you shall not be able to judge what is wise or easy, unless you are first resolved to judge what is just, and to do it. That is the one thing constantly re iterated by our Master—the order of all others that is given oftenest—"Do justice and judgment." That's your Bible order; that's the "Service of God" not praying nor psalm-singing. You are told, indeed, to sing psalms when you are merry, and to pray when you need anything; and, by the perversion of the Evil Spirit, we get to think that praying and psalm-singing are "service." If a child finds itself in want of anything, it runs in and asks its father for it—does it call that, doing its father a service? If it begs for a toy or a piece of cake—does it call that serving its father? That, with God, is prayer, and He likes to hear it: He likes you to ask Him for cake when you want it; but He doesn't call that "serving Him." Begging is not serving- God likes mere beggars as little as you do—He likes honest servants, not beggars. So when a child loves its father very much, and is very happy, it may sing little songs about him; but it doesn't call that, serving its father; neither is singing songs about God, serving God. It is enjoying ourselves, if it's anything; most probably it is nothing: but if it's anything, it is serving ourselves, not God. And yet we are impudent

enough to call our beggings and chauntings "Divine Service;" we say, "Divine service will be 'performed' " (that's our word—the form of it gone through "at eleven o'clock." Alas!—unless we perform Divine service in every willing act of life, we never perform it at all The one Divine work—the one ordered sacrifice—is to do justice; and it is the last we are ever inclined to do. Anything rather than that! As much charity as you choose, but no justice. "Nay," you will say, "charity is greater than justice." Yes, it is greater; it is the summit of justice—it is the temple of which justice is the foundation But you can't have the top without the bottom; you cannot build upon charity. You must build upon justice, for this main reason, that you have not, at first, charity to build with It is the last reward of good work. Do justice to your brother (you can do that, whether you love him or not), and you will come to love him. But do injustice to him, because you don't love him; and you will come to hate him. It is all very fine to think you can build upon charity to begin with; but you will find all you have got to begin with, begins at home, and is essentially love of yourself. You well-to-do people, for instance, who are here to-night, will go to "Divine Service" next Sunday, all nice and tidy, and your little childern will have there tight little Sunday boots on, and lovely little Sunday feathers in their hats; and you'll think, complacently and piously, how lovely they look! So they do; and you love them heartily, and you like sticking feathers in their hats. That's all right: that *is*

charity; but it is charity beginning at home. Then you will come to the poor little crossing-sweeper, got up also,—it, in its Sunday dress,—the dirtiest rags it has,—that it may beg the better: we shall give it a penny, and think how good we are. That's charity going abroad. But what does Justice say, walking and watching near us? Christian Justice has been strangely mute, and seemingly blind; and, if not blind, decrepit, this many a day: she keeps her accounts still, however—quite steadily—doing them at nights, carefully, with her bandage off, and through acutest spectacles (the only modern scientific invention she cares about) You must put your ear down even so close to her lips to hear her speak; and then you will start at what she first whispers, for it will certainly be, "Why shouldn't that little crossing-sweeper have a feather on its head, as well as your own child?" Then you may ask Justice, in an amazed manner," How she can possibly be so foolish as to think children could sweep crossings with feathers on their heads?" Then you stoop again, and Justice says—still in her dull, stupid way—"Then, why don't you, every other Sunday, leave your child to sweep the crossing, and take the little sweeper to church in a hat and feather?' Mercy on us (you think) what will she say next? And you answer, of course, that "you don't, because everybody ought to remain content in the position in which Providence has placed them." Ah, my friends, that's the gist of the whole question. *Did* Providence put them in that position, or did *you*? You knock a man into a ditch, and then you

tell him to remain content in the "position in which Providence has placed him." That's modern Christianity. You say—"*We* did not knock him into the ditch." How do you know what you have done, or are doing? That's just what we have all got to know, and what we shall never, know, until the question with us, every morning, is, not how to do the gainful thing, but how to do the just thing; nor until we are at least so far on the way to being Christian, as to have understood that maxim of the poor half-way Mahomedan, "One hour in the execution of justice is worth seventy years of prayer."

Justice in the payment for hand work: generally, good work, whether of the hand or head is either ill-paid or not paid at all. There will come a time for the better payment of handwork. But God means all good work to be done for nothing.

Supposing, then, we have it determined with appropriate justice, *who* is to do the hand work, the next questions must be how the hand workers are to be paid, and how they are to be refreshed, and what play they are to have. Now, the possible quantity of play depends on the possible quantity of pay; and the quantity of pay is not a matter for consideration to hand-workers only, but to all workers. Generally, good, useful work, whether of the hand or head, is either ill-paid, or nor paid at all. I don't say it should be so, but it always is so. People, as a rule, only pay for being amused on being cheated, not for being served. Five thousand a year to your talker, and a shilling a day to your fighter, digger, and thinker, is the rule. None of the best head work in art, literature, or science, is ever paid for. How much do you think Homer got for his *Iliad*? or Dante for his *Paradise*? only bitter bread and salt, and going up and down other people's stairs. In

science, the man who discovered the telescope. and first saw heaven, was paid with a dungeon: the man who invented the microscope, and first saw earth, died of starvation, driven from his home: it is indeed very clear that God means all thorougly good work and talk to be done for nothing. Baruch, the scribe, did not get a penny a line for writing Jeremiah's second roll for him. I fancy; and St. Stephen did not get bishop's pay for that long sermon of his to the Pharisees; nothing but stones. For indeed that is the world-father's proper payment. So surely as any of the world's children work for the world's good, honestly, with head and heart; and come to it, saying, "Give us a little bread, just to keep the life in us," the world-father answers them, "No my children, not bread; a stone, if you like, or as many as you need, to keep you quiet" But the hand-workers are not so ill off as all this comes to. The worst that can happen to *you* is to break stones; not be broken by them. And for you there will come a time for better payment; some day, assuredly, more pence will be paid to Peter the Fisherman, and fewer to Peter the Pope; we shall pay people not quite so much for talking in Parliament and doing nothing, as for holding their tongues out of it and doing something; we shall pay our ploughman a little more, and our lawyer a little less, and so on; but, at least, we may even now take care that whatever work is done shall be fully paid for; and the man who does it paid for it, not somebody else; and that it shall be done in an orderly, soldierly, well-guided, wholesome way, under good captains and

lieutenants of labour ; and that it shall have its appointed times of rest, and enough of them ; and that in those times the play shall be wholesome play, not in theatrical gardens, with tin flowers and gas sunshine, and girls dancing because of their misery ; but in true gardens, with real flowers, and real sunshine, and children dancing because of their gladness ; so that truly the streets shall be full (the "streets," mind you, not the gutters) of children, playing in the midst thereof. We may take care that working men shall have at least as good books to read as anybody else when they've time to read them ; and as comfortable firesides to sit at as anybody else, when they've time to sit at them. This, I think, can be managed for you, my working friends, in the good time

(4) Wise work and foolish work : the distinction between those who work wisely and those who work foolishly. Good work enforces justice and order.

IV I must go on, however, to our last head, concerning ourselves all, as workers. What is wise work, and what is foolish work ? What the difference between sense and nonsense, in daily occupation ?

Well, wise work is, briefly, work *with* God. Foolish work, is work *against* God. And work done with God, which He will help, may be briefly described as "Putting in Order"—that is, enforcing God's law of order, spiritual and material, over men and things. The first thing you have to do, essentially ; the real "good work" is, with respect to men, to enforce justice, and with respect to things, to enforce tidiness, and fruitfulness. And against these two great human deeds, justice and order, there are perpetually two great demons contending—the devil

of iniquity, or inequity, and the devil of disorder, or of death; for death is only consummation of disorder. You have to fight these two fiends daily. So far as you don't fight against the fiend of iniquity, you work for him. You "work iniquity." and the judgment upon you, for all your "Lord, Lord's," will be "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity." And so for as you do not resist the fiend of disorder, you work disorder, and you yourself do the work of Death, which is sin, and has for its wages, Death, himself.

Observe then, all wise work is mainly threefold in character. It is honest, useful, and cheerful.

The threefold character of wise work: (a) Honesty which is even more requisite in work than in play:

I. It is HONEST. I hardly know anything more strange than that you recognise honesty in play, and you do not in work. In your lightest games, you have always some one to see what you call "fair-play." In boxing, you must hit fair; in racing, start fair. Your English watchword is fair-play, your English hatred, foul-play. Did it ever strike you that you wanted another watchword also, fair-work, and another hatred also foul-work? Your prize-fighter has some honour in him yet; and so have the men in the ring round him: they will judge him to lose the match, by foul hitting. But your prize-merchant gains his match by foul selling, and no one cries out against that. You drive a gambler out of the gambling-room who loads dice, but you leave a tradesman in flourishing business, who loads scales! For observe, all dishonest dealing *is* loading scales. What does it matter whether I get short weight, adulterate

substance, or dishonest fabric? The fault in the fabric is incomparably the worst of the two. Give me short measure of food, and I only lose by you. but give me adulterate food, and I die by you. Here, then, is your chief duty, you workmen and tradesmen,—to be true to yourselves, and to us who would help you. We can do nothing for you, nor you for yourselves, without honesty. Get that, you get all ; without that, your suffrages, your reforms, your free-trade measures, your institutions of science, are all in vain. It is useless to put your heads together, if you can't put your hearts together. Shoulder to shoulder, right hand to right hand, among yourselves, and no wrong hand to anybody else, and you'll win the world yet.

(b) Usefulness: No wise work is a waste. No wise man degrades the worker, gathers his fruit and dismisses him to the grave.

II. Then, secondly, wise work is USEFUL. No man minds, or ought to mind, its being hard, if only it comes to something ; but when it is hard, and comes to nothing ; when all our bees' business turns to spiders'; and for honeycomb we have only resultant cobweb, blown away by the next breeze,—that is the cruel thing for the worker. Yet do we ever ask ourselves, personally, or even nationally, whether our work is coming to anything or not ? We don't care to keep what has been nobly done; still less do we care to do nobly what others would keep; and, least of ai , to make the work itself useful instead of deadly to the doer, so as to use his life indeed, but not to waste it. Of all wastes, the greatest waste that you can commit is the waste of labour. If you went down in the morning into your dairy, and you found that your youngest child had got down

before you ; and that he and the cat were at play together, and that he had poured out all the cream on the floor for the cat to lap up, you would scold the child, and be sorry the milk was wasted. But if, instead of wooden bowls with milk in them, there are golden bowls with human life in them, and instead of the cat to play with,—the devil to play with ; and you youreslf the player ; and instead of leaving that golden bowl to be broken by God at the fountain, you break it in the dust yourself, and pour the human blood out on the ground for the fiend to lick up—that is no waste! What! you perhaps think, "to waste the labour of men is not to kill them." Is it not? I should like to know how you could kill them more utterly—kill them with second deaths, seventh deaths, hundredfold deaths? It is the slightest way of killing to stop a man's breath. Nay, the hunger, and the cold, and the little whistling bullets—our love-messengers between nation and nation,—have brought pleasant messages from us to many a man before now; orders of sweet release, and leave at last to go where he will be most welcome and most happy. At the worst you do but shorten his life, you do not corrupt his life. But if you put him to base labour, if you bind his thoughts, if you blind his eyes, if you blunt his hopes, if you steal his joys, if you stunt his body, and blast his soul, and at last leave him not so much as to reap the poor fruit of his degradation, but gather that for yourself, and dismiss him to the grave, when you have done with him, having, so far as in you lay, made the walls of that grave everlasting : (though,

indeed, I fancy the goodly bricks of some of our family vaults will hold closer in the resurrection day than the sod over the labourers' head), this you think is no waste, and no sin!

(3) Cheerfulness: We must work for the coming of the Kingdom of God.

III. Then, lastly, wise work is CHEERFUL, as a child's work is. And now I want you to take one thought home with you, and let it stay with you.

Everybody in this room has been taught to pray daily, "Thy kingdom come." Now, if we hear a man swear in the streets, we think it very wrong, and say he "takes God's name in vain." But there's a twenty times worse way of taking His name in vain, than that. It is to *ask God for what we don't want*. He doesn't like that sort of prayer. If you don't want a thing, don't ask for it : such asking is the worst mockery of your King you can mock Him with ; the soldiers striking Him on the head with the reed was nothing to that. If you do not wish for his kingdom, don't pray for it. But if you do, you must do more than pray for it; you must work for it. And, to work for it, you must know what it is : we have all prayed for it many a day without thinking. Observe, it is a kingdom that is to come to us ; we are not to go to it. Also, it is not to be a kingdom of the dead, but of the living. Also, it is not to come all at once, but quietly ; nobody knows how. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." Also, it is not to come outside of us, but in the hearts of us : "the kingdom of God is within you." And, being within us, it is not a thing to be seen, but to be felt ; and though it brings all substance of good with it, it does not

consist in that: "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost:" joy, that is to say, in the holy, healthful, and helpful Spirit. Now, if we want to work for this kingdom, and to bring it, and enter into it, there's just one condition to be first accepted. You must enter it as children, or not at all: "Whosoever will not receive it as a little child shall not enter therein." And again, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Childlike innocence is essential for entering into the Kingdom of God. Heaven is not to be full of babies but of men with the character of children.

Of such, observe. Not of children themselves, but of such as children. I believe most mothers who read that text think that all heaven is to be full of babies. But that's not so. There will be children there, but the hoary head is the crown. "Length of days, and long life and peace," that is the blessing, not to die in babyhood. Children die but for their parents' sins; God means them to live, but He can't let them always; then they have their earlier place in heaven. and the little child of David, vainly prayed for;—the little child of Jeroboam, killed by its mother's step on its own threshold,—they will be there. But weary old David, and weary old Brazillai, having learned children's lessons at last, will be there too: and the one question for us all, young or old, is, have we learned our child's lesson? it is the *character* of children we want, and must gain at our peril; let us see, briefly, in what it consists.

The qualities characterising childhood are humility:

The first character of right childhood is that it is Modest. A well-bred child does not think it can teach its parents, that it knows every-

thing. It may think its father and mother know everything,—perhaps that all grown-up people know everything; very certainly it is sure that *it* does not. And it is always asking questions, and wanting to know more. Well, that is the first character of a good and wise man at his work. To know that he knows very little;—to perceive that there are many above him wiser than he; and to be always asking questions, wanting to learn, not to teach. No one ever teaches well who wants to teach, or governs well who wants to govern; it is an old saying (Plato's, but I know not if his, first), and as wise as old.

Faith: Then, the second character of right childhood is to be Faithful. Perceiving that its father knows best what is good for it, and having found always, when it has tried its own way againts his, that he was right and it was wrong, a noble child trusts him at last wholly, gives him its hand, and will walk blindfold with him, if he bids it. And that is the true character of all good men also, as obedient workers, or soldiers under captains. They must trust their captains;—they are bound for their lives to choose none but those whom they *can* trust. Then, they are not always to be thinking that what seems strange to them or wrong in what they are desired to do, is strange or wrong. They know their captain: where he leads they must follow, what he bids they must do; and without this trust and faith, without this captainship and soldiership, no great salvation, is possible to man. Among all the nations it is only when this faith is attained by them that

they become great; the Jew, the Greek, and the Mahometan, agree at least in testifying to this. It was a deed of this absolute trust which made Abraham the father of the faithful ; it was the declaration of the power of God as captain over all men, and the acceptance of a leader appointed by Him as commander of the faithful, which laid the foundation of whatever national power yet exists in the East ; and the deed of the Greeks, which has become the type of unselfish and noble soldiership to all lands, and to all times, was commemorated, on the tomb of those who gave their lives to do it, in the most pathetic, so far as I know, or can feel, of all human utterances : "Oh, stranger, go and tell our people that we are lying here, having *obeyed* their words."

Charity:

Then, the third character of right childhood is to be Loving and Generous Give a little love to a child, and you get a great deal back. It loves everything near it, when it is a right kind of child—would hurt nothing, would give the best it has away, always, if you need it—does not lay plans for getting everything in the house for itself, and delights in helping people ; you cannot please it so much as by giving it a chance of being useful, in ever so little a way.

and Cheerfulness.

And because of all these characters, lastly, it is Cheerful. Putting its trust in its father, it is careful for nothing—being full of love to every creature, it is happy always, whether in its play or its duty. Well, that's the great worker's character also. Taking no thought for the morrow ; taking thought only for

the duty of the day ; trusting somebody else to take care of the day ; knowing indeed what labour is, but not what sorrow is ; and always ready for play—beautiful play,—for lovely human play is like the play of the Sun. There's a worker for you. He, steady to his time, is set as a strong man to run his course, but also, *rejoiceth* as a strong man to run his course. See how he plays in the morning, with the mists below, and the clouds above, with a ray here and a flash there, and a shower of jewels everywhere;—that's the Sun's play and great human play is like his—all various—all full of light and life, and tender as the dew of the morning.

The Kingdom of God is of little children. There is poison in the counsels of the men this world.

So then, you have the child's character in these four things—Humility, Faith, Charity, and Cheerfulness. That's what you have got to be converted to. "Except ye be converted and become as little children"—You hear much of conversion now-a-days; but people always seem to think they have got to be made wretched by conversion,—to be converted to long faces. No, friends, you have got to be converted to short ones: you have to repent into childhood, to repent into delight, and delightsomeness. You can't go into a conventicle but you'll hear plenty of talk of backsliding. Backsliding, indeed ! I can tell you, on the ways most of us go, the faster we slide back the better. Slide back into the cradle, if going on is into the grave—back, I tell you ; back—out of your long faces, and into your long clothes. It is among children only, and as children only, that you will find medicine for your healing and true wisdom for

your teaching. There is poison in the counsels of the *men* of this world ; the words they speak are all bitterness, "the poison of asps is under their lips," but "the sucking child shall play by the hold of the asp." There is death in the looks of men. "Their eyes are privily against the poor," they are as the uncharmable serpent, the cockatrice, which slew by seeing. But "the weaned child shall lay his hand on the cockatric den." There is death in the steps of men: "their feet are swift to shed blood; they have compassed us in our steps like the lion that is greedy of his prey, and the young lion lurking in secret places," but, in that kingdom, the wolf shall lie down with the lamb, and the fatling with the lion, and "a little child shall lead them." There is death in the thoughts of men: the world is one wide riddle to them, darker and darker as it draws to a close; but the secret of it is known to the child, and the Lord of heaven and earth is most to be thanked in that "He has hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes." Yes, and there is death—infinitude of death in the principalities and powers of men. As far as the east is from the west, so far our sins are—*not* set from us, but multiplied around us: the Sun himself, think you he *now* "rejoices" to run his course, when he plunges westward to the horizon, so widely red, not with clouds, but blood? And it will be red more widely yet. Whatever drought of the early and latter rain may be, there will be none of that red rain. You fortify yourselves, you arm yourselves

against it in vain; the enemy and avenger will be upon you also, unless you learn that it is not out of the mouths of the knitted gun, or the smoothed rifle, but "out of the mouths of babes and sucklings" that the strength is ordained, which shall "still the enemy and avenger."

LECTURE II

TRAFFIC

(Delivered in the Town Hall, Bradford.)

My good Yorkshire friends, you asked me down here among your hills that I might talk to you about this Exchange you are going to build: but earnestly and seriously asking you to pardon me, I am going to do nothing of the kind. I cannot talk, or at least can say very little, about this same Exchange. I must talk of quite other things, though not willingly;—I could not deserve your pardon, if when you invited me to speak on one subject, I wilfully spoke on another. But I cannot speak, to purpose, of anything about which I do not care; and most simply and sorrowfully I have to tell you, in the outset, that I do *not* care about this Exchange of yours.

The exchange of Bradford: I do not care for it.

If, however, when you sent me your invitation, I had answered, "I won't come, I don't care about the Exchange of Bradford," you would have been justly offended with me, not knowing the reasons of so blunt a carelessness. So I have come down, hoping that you will patiently let me tell you why, on this, and many other such occasions, I now remain silent, when formerly I should have caught at the opportunity of speaking to a gracious audience.

I shall tell you why.

In a word, then, I do not care about this

The circumstances of the case. I do not care about it because you do n't. You only went to have the right th. ng for your m'oney.

Exchange,—because *you* don't ; and because you know perfectly well I cannot make you. Look at the essential circumstances of the case, which you, as business men, know perfectly well, though perhaps you think I forget them. You are going to spend £ 30,000, which to you, collectively, is nothing; the buying a new coat is, as to the cost of it, a much more important matter of consideration to me than building a new Exchange is to you. But you think you may as well have the right thing for your money. You know there are a great many odd styles of architecture about ; you don't want to do anything ridiculous; you hear of me, among others, as a respectable architectural man-milliner: and you send for me, that I may tell you the leading fashion; and what is, in our shops, for the moment, the newest and sweetest thing in pinnacles.

All good architeature is the expression of national life and character.

Now, pardon me for telling you frankly, you cannot have good architecture merely by asking people's advice on occasion. All good architecture is the expression of national life and character; and it is produced by a prevalent and eager national taste, or desire for beauty. And I want you to think a little of the deep significance of this word "taste," for no statement of mine has been more earnestly or oftener controverted than that good taste is essentially a moral quality. "No," say many of my antagonists, "taste is one thing, morality is another. Tell us what is pretty : we shall be glad to know that : but preach no sermons to us."

Permit me, therefore, to fortify this old dogma of mine somewhat. Taste is not only a part and an index of morality;—it is the ONLY morality. The first, and last, and closest trial question to any living creature is, "What do you like?" Tell me what you like, and I'll tell you what you are. Go out into the street, and ask the first man or woman you meet, what their "taste" is; and if they answer candidly, you know them, body and soul. "You, my friend in the rags, with the unsteady gait, what do *you* like?" "A pipe, and a quartern of gin." I know you. "You, good woman, with the quick step and tidy bonnet, what do you like?" "A swept hearth, and a clean tea-table; and my husband opposite me, and a baby at my breast." Good, I know you also. "You, little girl with the golden hair and the soft eyes, what do you like?" "My canary, and a run among the wood hyacinths." "You, little boy with the dirty hands, and the low forehead, what do you like?" "A shy at the sparrows, and a game at pitch-farthing." Good; we know them all now. What more need we ask?

Taste is an index of morality. Tell me what you like and I'll tell you what you are.

"Nay," perhaps you answer; "we need rather to ask what these people and children do, than what they like. If they *do* right, it is no matter that they like what is wrong; and if they *do* wrong, it is no matter that they like what is right. Doing is the great thing; and it does not matter that the man likes drinking, so that he does not drink; nor that the little girl likes to be kind to her canary, if she will not learn her lessons; nor that the little boy

Deeds and intentions: People are in a right moral state when they not merely do the right things but enjoy doing them.

likes throwing stones at the sparrows, if he goes to the Sunday school." Indeed, for a short time, and in a provisional sense, this is true. For if, resolutely, people do what is right, in time they come to like doing it. But they only are in a right moral state when they *have* come to like doing it; and as long as they don't like it, they are still in a vicious state. The man is not in health of body, who is always thirsting for the bottle in the cupboard, though he bravely bears his thirst; but the man who heartily enjoys water in the morning and wine in the evening, each in its proper quantity and time. And the entire object of true education is to make people not merely *do* the right things, but *enjoy* the right things—not merely industrious, but to love industry—not merely learned, but to love knowledge—not merely just, but to hunger and thirst after justice.

Taste for good works of art is a moral quality; and to teach taste is to form character. There will be no class-distinctions left when the tastes of all persons are alike.

But you may answer or think, "Is the liking for outside ornaments,—for pictures, or statues, or furniture, or architecture,—a moral quality?" Yes, most surely, if a rightly set liking. Taste for *any* pictures or statues is not a moral quality, but taste for good ones is. Only here again we have to define the word "good." I don't mean by "good," clever—or learned—or difficult in the doing Take a picture by Teniers, of sots quarrelling over their dice; it is an entirely clever picture; so clever that nothing in its kind has ever been done equal to it; but it is also an entirely base and evil picture. It is an expression of delight in the prolonged contemplation of a vile thing, and delight

in that is an "unmannered," or "immoral" quality. It is "bad taste" in the profoundest sense—it is the taste of the devils. On the other hand, a picture of Titian's, or a Greek statue or a Greek coin, or a Turner landscape, expresses delight in the perpetual contemplation of a good and perfect thing. That is an entirely moral quality —it is the taste of the angels. And all delight in art, and all love of it, resolve themselves into simple love of that which deserves love. That deserving is the quality which we call "loveliness"—(we ought to have an opposite word, hateliness, to be said of the things which deserve to be hated); and it is not an indifferent nor optional thing whether we love this or that; but it is just the function of all our being. What we *like* determines what we *are*, and is the sign of what we are; and to teach taste is inevitably to form character. As I was thinking over this, in walking up Fleet Street the other day, my eye caught the title of a book standing open in a bookseller's window. It was—*On the Necessity of the Diffusion of Taste among all Classes*. "Ah," I thought to myself, "my classifying friend, when you have diffused your taste, where will your classes be? The man who likes what you like, belongs to the same class with you, I think. Inevitably so. You may put him to other work if you choose; but, by the condition you have brought him into, he will dislike the other as much as you would yourself. You get hold of a scavenger, or a costermonger, who enjoyed the *Newgate Calendar* for literature, and "Pop goes the Weasel" for music. You think you can make him like Dante

and Beethoven? I wish you joy of your lessons; but if you do, you have made a gentleman of him:—he won't like to go back to his costermongering."

The English virtue of endurance and courage is writ large on the iron that the English workers cast and hammer. The English vice of jealousy expresses itself in every rivet of their iron armour and in wars. It is tragic when the whole world goes insane and paints itself red with blood.

And so completely and unexceptionally is this so, that, if I had time to-night, I could show you that a nation cannot be affected by any vice, or weakness, without expressing it legibly, and for ever, either in bad art, or by want of art; and that there is no national virtue, small or great, which is not manifestly expressed in all the art which circumstances enable the people possessing that virtue to produce. Take, for instance, your great English virtue of enduring and patient courage. You have at present in England only one art of any consequence—that is, iron-working. You know thoroughly well how to cast and hammer iron. Now, do you think in those masses of lava which you build volcanic cones to melt, and, which you forge at the mouths of the Infernos you have created; do you think, on those iron plates, your courage and endurance are not written for ever—not merely with an iron pen, but on iron parchment? And take also your great English vice—European vice—vice of all the world—vice of all other worlds that roll or shine in heaven, bearing with them yet the atmosphere of hell—the vice of jealousy, which brings competition into your commerce, treachery into your councils, and dishonour into your wars—that vice which has rendered for you, and for your next neighbouring nation, the daily occupations of existence no longer possible, but with the mail upon your breasts and the

sword loose in its sheath; so that, at last, you have realised for all the multitudes of the two great people who lead the so-called civilisation of the earth,—you have realised for them all, I say, in person and in policy, what was once true only of the rough Border riders of your Cheviot hills—

"They carved at the meal
With gloves of steel,
And they drank the red wine through the helmet barr'd;"—

do you think that this national shame and dastardliness of heart are not written as legibly on every rivet of your iron armour as the strength of the right hands that forged it? Friends, I know not whether this thing be the more ludicrous or the more melancholy. It is quite unspeakably both. Suppose, instead of being now sent for by you, I had been sent for by some private gentleman, living in a suburban house, with his garden separated only by a fruit-wall from his next door neighbour's; and he had called me to consult with him on the furnishing of his drawing-room. I begin looking about me, and find the walls rather bare; I think such and such a paper might be desirable—perhaps a little fresco here and there on the ceiling—a damask curtain or so at the windows. "Ah," says my employer, "damask curtains, indeed! That's all very fine, but you know I can't afford that kind of thing just now!" "Yet the world credits you with a splendid income!" "Ah, yes," says my friend, "but do you know, at present, I am

obliged to spend it nearly all in steel-traps ?" "Steel-traps for whom ?" "Why, for that fellow on the other side of the wall, you know : we're very good friends, capital friends ; but we are obliged to keep our traps set on both sides of the wall ; we could not possibly keep on friendly terms without them, and our spring guns. The worst of it is, we are both clever fellows enough ; and there's never a day passes that we don't find out a new trap, or a new gun-barrel, or something ; we spend about fifteen millions a year each in our traps, take it altogether ; and I don't see how we're to do with less." A highly comic state of life for two private gentlemen but for two nations, it seems to me, not wholly comic ? Bedlam would be comic, perhaps, if there were only one madman in it : and your Christmas pantomime is comic, when there is only one clown in it ; but when the whole world turns clown, and paints itself red with its own heart's blood instead of vermilion, it is something else than comic, I think.

Killing for a sensation is amusing for the victor but tragic for the victim.

Mind, I know a great deal of this is play, and willingly allow for that. You don't know what to do with yourselves for a sensation ; fox-hunting and cricketing will not carry you through the whole of this unendurably long mortal life : you liked popguns when you were schoolboys, and rifles and Armstrongs are only the same things better made ; but then the worst of it is, that which was play to you when boys, was not play to the sparrows ; and what is play to you now, is not play to the small birds of State neither ;

and for the black eagles, you are somewhat shy of taking shots at them, if I mistake not.

Art mirrors the national life,—its virtues as well as vices.

I must get back to the matter in hand, however. Believe me, without farther instance, I could show you, in all time, that every nation's vice, or virtue, was written in its art : the soldiership of early Greece ; the sensuality of late Italy; the visionary religion of Tuscany: the splendid human energy and beauty of Venice I have not time to do this to-night (I have done it elsewhere before now); but I proceed to apply the principle to ourselves in a more searching manner

You worship in Gothic churches but live in houses built according to another school of architecture. You have separated your religion from your life.

I notice that among all the new buildings which cover your once wild hills, churches and schools are mixed in due, that is to say, in large proportion, with your mills and mansions ; and I notice also that the churches and schools are almost always Gothic, and the mansions and mills are never Gothic. Will you allow me to ask precisely the meaning of this ? For, remember, it is peculiarly a modern phenomenon. When Gothic was invented, houses were Gothic as well as churches ; and when the Italian style superseded the Gothic, churches were Italian as well as houses. If there is a Gothic spire to the cathedral of Antwerp, there is a Gothic belfry to the Hotel de Ville at Brussels; if Inigo Jones builds an Italian Whitehall, Sir Christopher Wren builds an Italian St. Paul's. But now you live under one school of architecture, and worship under another. What do you mean by doing this ? Am I to understand that you are thinking of changing your architecture back to Gothic ; and that you treat your

churches experimentally, because it does not matter what mistakes you make in a church? Or am I to understand that you consider Gothic a pre-eminently sacred and beautiful mode of building, which you think, like the fine frankincense, should be mixed for the tabernacle only, and reserved for your religious services? For if this be the feeling, though it may seem at first as if it were graceful and reverent, you will find that, at the root of the matter, it signifies neither more nor less than that you have separated your religion from your life.

For consider what a wide significance this fact has; and remember that it is not you only, but all the people of England, who are behaving thus just now.

You call the church the house of God. But it is neither the church nor the stone but the place on which it is built, that is sanctified.

You have all got into the habit of calling the church "the house of God." I have seen, over the doors of many churches, the legend actually carved, "*This* is the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." Now, note where that legend comes from and of what place it was first spoken. A boy leaves his father's house to go on a long journey on foot, to visit his uncle: he has to cross a wild hill-desert; just as if one of your own boys had to cross the worlds of Westmoreland, to visit an uncle at Carlisle. The second or third day your boy finds himself somewhere between Hawes and Brough, in the midst of the moors, at sunset. It is stony ground, and boggy; he cannot go one foot farther that night. Down he lies, to sleep, on Wharnside, where best he may, gathering a few of the stones together

to put under his head ;—so wild the place is, he cannot get anything but stones. And there, lying under the broad night, he has a dream ; and he sees a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reaches to heaven, and the angels of God are ascending and descending upon it. And when he wakes out of his sleep, he says, "How dreadful is this place ; this is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven " This PLACE, observe ; not this church ; not this city ; not this stone even, which he puts up for a memorial—the piece of flint on which his head has lain But *this* place ; this windy slope of Wharnside ; this moorland hollow, torrent-bitten, snow-blighted ; this *any* place where God lets down the ladder. And how are you to know where that will be ? or how are you to determine where it may be, but by being ready for it always ? Do you know where the lightning is to fall next ? You *do* know that, partly ; you can guide the lightning ; but you cannot guide the going forth of the Spirit, which is as that lightning when it shines from the east to the west.

Churches are not temples but only gathering places.

But the perpetual and insolent warping of that strong verse to serve a merely ecclesiastical purpose, is only one of the thousand instances in which we sink back into gross Judaism. We call our churches "temples." Now, you know, or ought to know, they are *not* temples. They have never had, never can have, anything whatever to do with temples. They are "synagogues"—"gathering places"—where you gather yourselves together as an

assembly; and by not calling them so, you again miss the force of another mighty text—"Thou when thou prayest, shall not be as the hypocrites are; for they love to pray standing in the *churches*" [we should translate it], "that they may be seen of men. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father,"—which is, not in chancel nor in aisle, but "in secret."

The holiness of hearths and homes: the church may be sacred, but you must also remember that the whole earth is.

Now, you feel, as I say this to you—I know you feel—as if I were trying to take away the honour of your churches. Not so; I am trying to prove to you the honour of your houses and your hills; I am trying to show you—not that the Church is not sacred—but that the whole Earth is. I would have you feel, what careless, what constant, what infectious sin there is in all modes of thought, whereby, in calling your churches only "holy," you call your hearths and homes profane; and have separated yourselves from the heathen by casting all your household gods to the ground, instead of recognising, in the places of their many and feeble Lares, the presence of your One and Mighty Lord and Lar.

Good architecture is essentially religious: the corrupt architecture of the Renaissance indicates national infidelity. Hence the style of the Exchange

"But what has all this to do with our Exchange?" you ask me, impatiently. My dear friends, it has just everything to do with it; on these inner and great questions depend all the outer and little ones; and if you have asked me down here to speak to you, because you had before been interested in anything I have written, you must know that all I have

yet said about architecture was to show this. The book I called *The Seven Lamps* was to show that certain right states of temper and moral feeling were the magic powers by which all good architecture, without exception, had been produced *The Stones of Venice* had, from beginning to end, no other aim than to show that the Gothic architecture of Venice had risen out of, and indicated in all its features, a state of pure national faith, and of domestic virtue; and that its Renaissance architecture had arisen out of, and in all its features indicated, a state of concealed national infidelity, and of domestic corruption. And now, you ask me what style is best to build in; and how can I answer, knowing the meaning of the two styles, but by another question—do you mean to build as Christians or as Infidels? And still more—do you mean to build as honest Christians or as honest Infidels? as thoroughly and confessedly either one or the other? You don't like to be asked such rude questions. I cannot help it; they are of much more importance than this Exchange business; and if they can be at once answered, the Exchange business settles itself in a moment. But, before I press them farther, I must ask leave to explain one point clearly. In all my past work, my endeavour has been to show that good architecture is essentially religious—the production of a faithful and virtuous, not of an infidel and corrupted, people. But in the course of doing this, I have had also to show that good architecture is not *ecclesiastical*. People are so apt to look upon

Building depends on whether you want to build as Christians or as Infidels. Good architecture is not necessarily ecclesiastical.

religion as the business of the clergy, not their own, that the moment they hear of anything depending on "religion," they think it must also have depended on the priesthood ; and I have had to take what place was to be occupied between these two errors, and fight both, often with seeming contradiction. Good architecture is the work of good and believing men; therefore, you say, at least some people say, "Good architecture must essentially have been the work of the clergy, not of the laity." No—a thousand times no; good architecture has always been the work of the commonalty, *not* of the clergy. What, you say, those glorious cathedrals—the pride of Europe—did their builders not form Gothic architecture ? No ; they corrupted Gothic architecture. Gothic was formed in the baron's castle, and the burgher's street. It was formed by the thoughts, and hands, and powers of free citizens and soldier kings. By the monk it was as an instrument for the aid of his superstition . when that superstition became a beautiful madness, and the best hearts of Europe vainly dreamed and pined in the cloister, and vainly raged and perished in the crusade,—through that fury of perverted faith and wasted war, the Gothic rose also to its loveliest, most fantastic, and finally, most foolish dreams; and, in those dreams, was lost.

National architecture is the result and exponent of national religion: not of a clerical company but of a whole people.

I hope, now, that there is no risk of your misunderstanding me when I come to the gist of what I want to say to-night;—when I repeat, that every great national architecture has been the result and exponent of a great national religion. You can't have bits of it here, bits

there—you must have it every where or nowhere. It is not the monopoly of a clerical company—it is not the exponent of a theological dogma—it is not the hieroglyphic writing of an initiated priesthood; it is the manly language of a people inspired by resolute and common purpose, and rendering resolute and common fidelity to the legible laws of an undoubted God.

The three schools of European architecture: Greek, medieval and renaissance.

Now there have as yet been three distinct schools of European architecture. I say, European, because Asiatic and African architectures belong so entirely to other races and climates, that there is no question of them here; only, in passing, I will simply assure you that whatever is good or great in Egypt, and Syria, and India, is just good or great for the same reasons as the buildings on our side of the Bosphorous. We Europeans, then, have had thiee great religions; the Greek, which was the worship of the God of Wisdom and Power; the Mediaeval, which was the worship of the God of Judgment and Consolation; the Renaissance, which was the worship of the God of Pride and Beauty: these three we have had—they are past,—and now, at last, we English have got a fourth religion, and a God of our own, about which I want to ask you. But I must explain these three old ones first.

The Greeks worshipped Wisdom.

I repeat, first the Greeks essentially worshipped the God of Wisdom; so that whatever contended against their religion,—to the Jews a stumbling-block,—was, to the Greeks,—*Foolishness*.

The first Greek idea of deity was that

Athena is the goddess giving perfect knowledge.

expressed in the word, of which we keep the remnant in our words "*Di*-urnal" "*Di* vine"—the god of *Day*, Jupiter the revealer. Athena is his daughter, but especially daughter of the Intellect, springing armed from the head We are only with the help of recent investigation beginning to penetrate the depth of meaning couched under the Athenaic symbols: but I may note rapidly, that her aegis, the mantle with the serpent fringes, in which she often, in the best statues, is represented as folding up her left hand for better guard, and the Gorgon on her shield, are both representative, mainly of the chilling horror and sadness, (turning men to stone, as it were,) of the outmost and superficial spheres of knowledge—the knowledge which separates, in bitterness, hardness, and sorrow, the heart of the full-grown man from the heart of the child. For out of imperfect knowledge spring terror, dissension, danger, and disdain: but from perfect knowledge, given by the full-revealed Athena, strength and peace, in sign of which she is crowned with the olive spray, and bears the resistless spear.

Greek architecture was an expression of this worshib of Wisdom.

This, then, wat the Greek conception of purest Deity, and every habit of life, and every form of his art developed themselves from seeking this bright, serene, resistless wisdom; and setting himself, as a man, to do things evermore rightly and strongly;* not with any

*It is an error to suppose that the Greek worship, or seeking, was chiefly of Beauty. It was essentially of Rightness and Strength, founded on Forethought: the principal character of Greek art is not beauty, but Design; and the Dorian Apollo-worship and Athenian

ardent affection or ultimate hope, but with a resolute and continent energy of will, as knowing that for failure there was no consolation, and for sin there was no remission. And the Greek architecture rose unerring, bright, clearly defined, and self-contained.

Medieval Christianity, with its doctrine of the remission of sins, gave rise to an architecture expressing both melancholy and aspiration.

Next followed in Europe the great Christian faith, which was essentially the religion of Comfort. Its great doctrine is the remission of sins; for which cause it happens, too often in certain phases of Christianity, that sin and sickness themselves are partly glorified, as if, the more you had to be healed of, the more divine was the healing. The practical result of this doctrine, in art, is a continual contemplation of sin and disease, and of imaginary states of purification from them; thus we have an architecture conceived in a mingled sentiment of melancholy and aspiration, partly severe, partly luxuriant, which will bend itself to every one of our needs, and every one of our fancies, and be strong or weak with us, we are strong or weak ourselves. It is, of all architecture, the basest, when base people build it—of all, the noblest, when built by the noble

Both the Greek and the medieval religions perished by falsehood.

And now note that both these religions—Greek and Mediaeval—perished by falsehood in their own main purpose. The Greek religion of

Virgin-worship are both expressions of adoration of divine Wisdom and Purity. Next to these great deities rank, in power over the national mind, Dionysus and Ceres, the givers of human strength and life; then, for heroic examples, Hercules. There is no Venus-worship among the Greeks in the great times. and the Muses are essentially teachers of truth, and of its harmonies.

Wisdom perished in a false philosophy—"Oppositions of science, falsely so called." The Medaieval religion of Consolation perished in false comfort; in remission of sins given lyingly It was the selling of abso'ution that ended the Mediaeval faith; and I can tell you more, it is the selling of absolution which, to the end of time. will mark false Chr stianity. Pure Christianity gives her remission of sins only by *ending* them; but false Christianity gets her remission of sins by *compounding* for them. And there are many ways of compounding for them. We English have beautiful little quiet ways of buying absolution, whether in low Church or high, far more cunning than any of Tezel's trading.

The Renaissance architecture is an expression of the religion of pleasure.

Then, thirdly, there followed the religion of Pleasure, in which all Europe give itself to luxury, ending in death. First, *bals masques* in every saloon, and then guillotines in every square. And all these three worships issue in vast temple building. Your Greek worshipped Wisdom, and built you the Parthenon—the Virgin's temple The Mediaeval worshipped Consolation, and built you Virgin temples also—but to our Lady of Salvation. Then the Revivalist worshipped beauty, of a sort, and built you Versailles, and the Vatican. Now, lastly, will you tell me what *we* worship, and what *we* build?

We worship the Goddess of getting-on and we build our ware-houses and exchanges to her.

You know we are speaking always of the real, active, continual, national worship; that by which men act while they live; not that which they talk of when they die. Now, we have, indeed, a nominal religion, to which we

pay tithes of property and sevenths of time; but we have also a practical and earnest religion, to which we devote nine-tenths of our property and six-sevenths of our time. And we dispute a great deal about the nominal religion; but we are all unanimous about this practical one, of which I think you will admit that the ruling goddess may be best generally described as the "Goddess of Getting-on", or "Britannia of the Market." The Athenians had an "Athena Agoraia, or Minerva of the Market; but she was a subordinate type of their goddess, while our Britannia Agoraia is the principal type of ours. And all your great architectural works are, of course, built to her. It is long since you built a great cathedral; and how you would laugh at me, if I proposed building a cathedral on the top of one of these hills of yours, taking it for an Acropolis! But your railroad mounds, prolonged masses of Acropolis; your railroad stations, vaster than the Parthenon, and innumerable; your chimneys, how much more mightly and costly than cathedral spires! your harbour piers; your warehouses; your exchanges!—all these are built to your great Goddess of "Getting-on": and she has formed, and will continue to form, your architecture, as long as you worship her: and it is quite vain to ask me to tell you how to build to *her*; you know far better than I.

All beautiful architecture must be adorned with sculpture or painting. The

There might, indeed, on some theories, be a conceivably good architecture for Exchanges —that is to say if there were any heroism in the fact or deed of exchange, which might be

right subjects for these latter are heroisms of some sort. But Exchange or Commerce has no heroisms of its own as yet. You could have at the best a frieze with pendant purses and a statue of Britannia of the Market.

typically carved on the outside of your building. For, you know, all beautiful architecture must be adorned with sculpture or painting; and for sculpture or painting you must have a subject. And hitherto it has been a received opinion among the nations of the world that the only right subjects for either, were *heroisms* of some sort. Even on his pots and his flagons, the Greek put a Hercules slaying lions, or an Apollo slaying serpents, or Bacchus slaying melancholy giants, and earthborn despondencies. On his temples, the Greek put contests of great warriors in founding states, or of gods with evil spirits. On his houses and temples alike, the Christian put carvings of angels conquering devils; or of hero-martyrs exchanging this world for another; subject inappropriate, I think, to our manner of exchange here. And the Master of Christians not only left his followers without any orders as to the sculpture of affairs of exchange on the outside of buildings, but gave some strong evidence of his dislike of affairs of exchange within them. And yet there might surely be a heroism in such affairs; and all commerce become a kind of selling of doves, not impious. The wonder has always been great to me, that heroism has never been supposed to be in anywise consistent with the practice of supplying people with food, or clothes; but rather with that of quartering oneself upon them for food, and stripping them of their clothes. Spoiling of armour is an heroic deed in all ages; but the selling of clothes, old, or new, has never taken any colour of magnanimity. Yet one does not

see why feeding the hungry and clothing the naked should ever become base businesses, even when engaged in on a large scale. If one could contrive to attach the notion of conquest to them anyhow? so that, supposing there were anywhere an obstinate race, who refused to be comforted, one might take some pride in giving them compulsory comfort; and as it were, "occupying a country" with one's gifts instead of one's armies? If one could only consider it as much a victory to get a barren field sown, as to get an eared field stripped ; and contend who should build villages, instead of who should "carry" them. Are not all forms of heroism conceivable in doing these serviceable deeds ? You doubt who is strongest ? It might be ascertained by push of spade, as well as push of sword. Who is wisest ? There are witty things to be thought of in planning other business than campaigns. Who is bravest ? There are always the elements to fight with, stronger than men ; and nearly as merciless. The only absolutely and unapproachably heroic element in the soldier's work seems to be—that he is paid little for it—and regularly: while you traffickers, and exchangers, and others occupied in presumably benevolent business, like to be paid much for it—and by chance. I never can make out how it is that a knight-errant does not expect to be paid for his trouble, but a pedlar-errant always does;—that people are willing to take hard knocks for nothing, but never to sell ribands cheap ;—that they are ready to go on fervent crusades to recover the tomb of a buried God ;—that they will go anywhere barefoot to

preach their faith, but must be well bribed to practise it, and are perfectly ready to give the Gospel gratis, but never the loaves and fishes. If you chose to take the matter up on any such soldierly principle, to do your commerce, and your feeding of nations, for fixed salaries; and to be as particular about giving people the best food, and the best cloth, as soldier are about giving them the best gunpowder, I could carve something for you on your exchange worth looking at. But I can only at present suggest decorating its frieze with pendant purses; and making its pillars broad at the base, for the sticking of bills. And in the innermost chambers of it there might be a statue of Britannia of the Market, who may have, perhaps advisably, a partridge for her crest, typical at once of her courage in fighting for noble ideas ; and of her interest in game ; and round its neck the inscription in golden letters, "Perdix fovit quae non peperit"* Then, for her spear, she might have a weaver's beam ; and on her shield, instead of her Cross, the Milanese boar, semi-fleeced, with the town of Gennesaret proper, in the field and the legend. "In the best market," and her corslet, of leather, folded over her heart in the shape of a purse, with thirty slits in it for a piece of money to go in at, on each day of the month. And I doubt not but that people would come to see your exchange, and its goddess, with applause.

* Jerem, xvii. II (best in Septuagint and Vulgate). "As the partridge, fostering what she brought not forth, so he that getteth riches, not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his days, and at his end shall be a fool."

Nevertheless, I want to point out to you certain strange characters in this goddess of yours. She differs from the great Greek and Mediaeval deities essentially in two things—first, as to the continuance of her presumed power; secondly, as to the extent of it.

But where will your goddess take you? To what end is all your hoarding? The right way of spending money is even more important than hoarding it.

Ist, as to the continuance.

The Greek goddess of Wisdom gave continual increase of wisdom, as the Christian Spirit of Comfort (or Comforter) continual increase of comfort. There was no question, with these, of any limit of cessation of function. But with your Agora Goddess, that is just the most important question. Getting on—but where to? Gathering together—but how much? Do you mean to gather always—never to spend? If so, I wish you joy of your goddess, for I am just as well-off as you, without the trouble of worshipping her at all. But if you do not spend, somebody else will—somebody else must. And it is because of this (among many other such errors) that I have fearlessly declared your so-called science of Political Economy to be no science; because, namely, it has omitted the study of exactly the most important branch of the business—the study of *spending*. For spend you must, and as much as you make, ultimately. You gather corn:—will you bury England under a heap of grain; or will you, when you have gathered, finally eat? You gather gold:—will you make your house-roofs of it, or pave your streets with it? That is still one way of spending it. But if you keep it, that you may get more, I'll give you more; I'll give you all the gold you want—all you can imagine.

—if you can tell me what you'll do with it. You shall have thousands of gold pieces;—thousands of thousands—millions—mountains, of gold: where will you keep them? Will you put an Olympus of silver upon a golden Pelion—make Ossa like a wart? Do you think the rain and dew would then come down to you, in the stream from such mountains, more blessedly than they will down the mountains which God has made for you, of moss and whin-stone? But it is not gold that you want to gather! What is it? greenbacks? No; not those neither. What is it then—is it ciphers after a capital I? Cannot you practise writing ciphers, and write as many as you want? Write ciphers for an hour every morning, in a big book, and say every evening, I am worth all those noughts more than I was yesterday. Won't that do? Well, what in the name of Plutus is it you want? Not gold, not greenbacks, not ciphers after a capital I? You will have to answer, after all. "No; we want, somehow or other, money's *worth*." Well, what is that? Let your Goddess of Getting-on discover it, and let her learn to stay therein.

Pallas and Madonna were supposed to teach or comfort all men. But your goddess is only the goddess of somebody's getting-on.

II. But there is yet another question to be asked respecting this Goddess of Getting-on. The first was of the continuance of her power; the second is of its extent.

Pallas and the Madonna were supposed to be all the world's Pallas, and all the world's Madonna They could teach all men, and they could comfort all men. But, look strictly into the nature of the power of your Goddess of Getting-on; and you will find she is the Goddess—

not of everybody's getting on—but only of somebody's getting on. This is a vital, or rather deathful, distinction. Examine it in your own ideal of the state of national life which this Goddess is to evoke and maintain. I asked you what it was, when I was last here;*—you have never told me. Now, shall I try to tell you?

Your ideal is thus a ghastly picture—comfort for the few and misery for the many.

Your ideal of human life then is, I think, that it should be passed in a pleasant undulating world, with iron and coal everywhere underneath it. On each pleasant bank of this world is to be a beautiful mansion, with two wings; and stables, and coach-houses; a moderately sized park; a large garden and hot-houses; and pleasant carriage drives through the shrubberies. In this mansion are to live the favoured votaries of the Goddess; the English gentleman, with his gracious wife, and his beautiful family; always able to have the boudoir and the jewels for the wife, and the beautiful ball dresses for the daughters, and hunters for the sons, and a shooting in the Highlands for himself. At the bottom of the bank, is to be the mill; not less than a quarter of mile long, with a steam engine at each end, and two in the middle, and a chimney three hundred feet high. In this mill are to be in constant employment from eight hundred to a thousand workers, who never drink, never strike, always go to church on Sunday, and always express themselves in respectful language.

Is not that, broadly, and in the main features, the kind of thing you propose to your-

**Two Paths.*

Your goddess stands for the theory that they should keep who can. It is true that some will have to be at the top and some at the bottom. But the top-men are known by their taking the least advantage for themselves.
Kings are royal labourers, just as there are loyal labourers.

selves? It is very pretty indeed, seen from above; not at all so pretty, seen from below. For, observe, while to one family this deity is indeed the Goddess of Getting-on, to a thousand families she is the Goddess of *not* Getting-on. "Nay," you say, "they have all their chance." Yes, so has every one in a lottery, but there must always be the same number of blanks. "Ah ? but in a lottery it is not skill and intelligence which take the lead, but blind chance." What then ! do you think the old practice, that "they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can," is less iniquitous, when the power has become power of brains instead of fist? and that though we may not take advantage of a child's or a woman's weakness, we may of a man's foolishness ? "Nay, but finally, work must be done, and some one must be at the top, some one at the bottom." Granted, my friends. Work must always be, and captains of work must always be ; and if you in the least remember the tone of any of my writings, you must know that they are thought unfit for this age, because they are always insisting on need of government, and speaking with scorn of liberty. But I beg you to observe that there is a wide difference between being captains or governors of work, and taking the profits of it. It does not follow, because you are general of an army, that you are to take all the treasure, or land, it wins (if it fights for treasure or land); neither, because you are king of a nation, that you are to consume all the profits of the nation's work. Real kings, on the contrary, are known

invariably by their doing quite the reverse of this,—by their taking the least possible quantity of the nation's work for themselves. There is no test of real kinghood so infallible as that. Does the crowned creature live simply, bravely, unostentatiously ? probably he *is* a King. Does he cover his body with jewels, and his table with delicates ? in all probability he is *not* a King. It is possible he may be, as Solomon was ; but that is when the nation shares his splendour with him. Solomon made gold, not only to be in his own palace as stones, but to be in Jerusalem as stones. But, even so, for the most part, these splendid kinghoods expire in ruin, and only the true kinghoods live, which are of royal labourers governing loyal labourers ; who, both leading rough lives, establish the true dynasties. Conclusively you will find that because you are king of a nation, it does not follow that you are to gather for yourself all the wealth of that nation ; neither, because you are king of a small part of the nation, and lord over the means of its maintenance—over field, or mill, or mine, are you to take all the produce of that piece of the foundation of national existence for yourself.

Your goddess the mills cannot go on for ever. There must come a change,—for better or for worse.

You will tell me I need not preach against these things, for I cannot mend them. No, good friends, I cannot ; but you can, and you will ; or something else can and will. Do you think these phenomena are to stay always in their present power or aspect ? All history shows, on the contrary, that to be the exact thing they never can do. Change *must* come ; but it is ours to determine whether change of

growth, or change of death. Shall the Parthenon be in ruins on its rock, and Bolton priory in its meadow, but these mills of yours be the consummation of the buildings of the earth, and their wheels be as the wheels of eternity? Think you that "men may come, and men may go," but—mills—go on for ever? Not so; out of these, better or worse shall come; and it is for you to choose which.

The modern economist would tell us that to do the best for ourselves is to do the best for others. But the teaching of Christ is exactly the opposite of this,—selflessness. And even Plato condemned this pursuit of material possessions.

I know that none of this wrong is done with deliberate purpose. I know, on the contrary, that you wish your workmen well; that you do much for them, and that you desire to do more for them, if you saw your way to it, safely. I know that many of you have done, and are everyday doing, whatever you feel to be in your power; and that even all this wrong and misery are brought about by a warped sense of duty, each of you striving to do his best, without noticing that this best is essentially and centrally the best for himself, not for others. And all this has come out of the spreading of that thrice accursed, thrice impious doctrine of the modern economist, that, "To do the best for yourself, is finally to do the best for others." Friends, our great Master said not so; and most absolutely we shall find this world is not made so. Indeed, to do the best for others, is finally to do the best for ourselves; but it will not do to have our eyes fixed on that issue. The Pagans had got beyond that. Hear what a Pagan says of this matter; hear what were, perhaps, the last written words of Plato,—if not the last actually written, (for this we cannot know,) yet assuredly in

fact and power his parting words—in which, endeavouring to give full crowning and harmonious close to all his thoughts, and to speak the sum of them by the imagined sentence of the Great Spirit, his strength and his heart fail him, and the words cease, broken off for ever. It is the close of the dialogue called "Critias," in which he describes, partly from real tradition, partly in ideal dream, the early stage of Athens; and the genesis, and order, and religion, of the fabled isle of Atlantis ; in which genesis he conceives the same first perfection and final degeneracy of man, which in our own Scriptural tradition is expressed by saying that the Sons of God intermarried with the daughters of men, for he supposes the earliest race to have been indeed the children of God ; and to have corrupted themselves, until "their spot was not the spot of his children." And this, he says, was the end ; that indeed "through many generations, so long as the God's nature in them yet was full, they were submissive to the sacred laws, and carried themselves lovingly to all that had kindred with them in divineness; for their uttermost spirit was faithful and true, and in every wise great ; so that, in all meekness of wisdom, they dealt with each other, and took all the chances of life ; and despising all things except virtue, they cared little what happened day by day, and *bore lightly the burden* of gold and of possessions; for they saw that, if only their common love and virtue increased, all these things would be increased together with them ; but to set their esteem and ardent pursuit upon material possession, would be to

lose that first, and their virtue and affection together with it. And by such reasoning, and what of the divine nature remained in them, they gained all this greatness of which we have already told; but when the God's part of them faded and became extinct, being mixed again and again, and effaced by the prevalent mortality; and the human nature at last exceeded, they then became unable to endure the courses of fortune; and fell into shapelessness of life, and baseness in the sight of him who could see, having lost everything that was fairest of their honour; while to the blind hearts which could not discern the true life, tending to happiness, it seemed that they were then chiefly noble and happy, being filled with all iniquity of inordinate possession and power. Whereupon, the God of Gods, whose Kinghood is in laws, beholding a once just nation thus cast into misery, and desiring to lay such punishment upon them as might make them repent into restraining, gathered together all the gods into his dwelling place, which from heaven's centre overlooks whatever has part in creation; and having assembled them, he said"—

Do not make the Goddess of Getting-on your principal idol. Fix your mind on some honest and simple order of existence—for all men as for yourselves.

The rest is silence. So ended are the last words of the chief wisdom of the heathen, spoken of this idol of riches; this idol of yours; this golden image, high by measureless cubits, set up where your green fields of England are furnace-burnt into the likeness of the plain of Dura; this idol, forbidden to us, first of all idols, by our own Master and faith; forbidden to us also by every human lip that has ever, in

any age or people, been accounted of as able to speak according to the purpose of God. Continue to make that forbidden deity your principal one, and soon no more art, no more science, no more pleasure will be possible. Catastrophe will come; or, worse than catastrophe, slow mouldering and withering into Hades. But if you can fix some conception of a true human state of life to be striven for—life for all men as for yourselves—if you can determine some honest and simple order of existence; following those trodden ways of wisdom, which are pleasantness, and seeking her quiet and withdrawn paths, which are peace;—then, and so sanctifying wealth into "common-wealth," all your art, your literature, your daily labours, your domestic affection, and citizen's duty, will join and increase into one magnificent harmony. You will know then how to build, well enough; you will build with stone well, but with flesh better; temples not made with hands, but riveted of hearts; and that kind of marble, crimson-veined, is indeed eternal.

LECTURE III

WAR

(Delivered at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich).

It is not necessary that a writer on painting should speak to you about war. The knightly example and the few words of veteran soldiers would suffice.

YOUNG SOLDIERS, I do not doubt but that many of you came unwillingly to-night, and many in merely contemptuous curiosity, to hear what a writer on painting could possibly say, or would venture to say, respecting your great art of war. You may well think within yourselves, that a painter might, perhaps without immodesty, lecture younger painters upon painting, but not young lawyers upon law, nor young physicians upon medicine—least of all, it may seem to you, young warriors upon war. And, indeed, when I was asked to address you, I declined at first, and declined long ; for I felt that you would not be interested in my special business, and would certainly think there was small need for me to come to teach you yours. Nay, I knew that there ought to be *no* such need, for the great veteran soldiers of England are now men every way so thoughtful, so noble, and so good, that no other teaching than their knightly example, and their few words of grave and tried counsel, should be either necessary for you, or even, without assurance of due modesty in the offerer, endured by you.

But being asked, not once nor twice, I have not ventured persistently to refuse : and I will

try, in very few words, to lay before you some reason why you should accept my excuse, and hear me patiently. You may imagine that your work is wholly foreign to, and separate from mine. So far from that, all the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war; no great art ever yet rose on earth, but among a nation of soldiers. There is no art among a shepherd people, if it remains at peace. There is no art among an agricultural people, if it remains at peace. Commerce is barely consistent with fine art; but cannot produce it. Manufacture not only is unable to produce it, but invariably destroys whatever seeds of it exist There is no great art possible to a nation but that which is based on battle.

But your work is not wholly foreign to mine. All the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war.

Now, though I hope you love fighting for its own sake, you must, I imagine, be surprised at my assertion that there is any such good fruit of fighting. You supposed, probably, that your office was to defend the works of peace, but certainly not to found them: nay, the common course of war, you may have thought, was only to destroy them. And truly, I, who tell you this of the use of war, should have been the last of men to tell you so, had I trusted my own experience only. Hear why: I have given a considerable part of my life to the investigation of Venetian painting; and the result of that enquiry was my fixing upon one man as the greatest of all Venetians, and therefore, as I believed, of all painters whatsoever. I formed this faith, (whether right or wrong matters at present nothing,) in the supremacy of the painter Tintoret, under a roof covered with his

I am not speaking out of inexperience. I have seen three of my favourite Venetian paintings torn to rags by bomb-shells. Yet I believe that war is the foundation of all great art.

pictures; and of those pictures, three of the noblest were then in the form of shreds of ragged canvas, mixed up with the laths of the roof, rent through by three Austrian shells. Now, it is not every lecturer who *could* tell you that he had seen three of his favourite pictures torn to rags by bomb-shells. And after such a sight, it is not every lecturer who *would* tell you that, nevertheless, war was the foundation of all great art.

The first dawn of the best art is in Egypt. And it consists of sculptures of kings going out to battle and such other subjects.

Yet the conclusion is inevitable, from any careful comparison of the states of great historic races at different periods. Merely to show what I mean, I will sketch for you, very briefly, the broad steps of the advance of the best art of the world. The first dawn of it is in Egypt; and the power of it is founded on the perpetual contemplation of death, and of future judgment, by the mind of a nation of which the ruling castes were priests, and the second, soldiers. The greatest works produced by them are sculptures of their kings going out to battle, or receiving the homage of conquered armies. And you must remember also, as one of the great keys to the splendour of the Egyptian nation, that the priests were not occupied in theology only. Their theology was the basis of practical government and law; so that they were not so much priests as religious judges; the office of Samuel, among the jews, being as nearly as possible correspondent to theirs.

The same is true of all Greek art.

All the rudiments of art then, and much more than the rudiments of all science, are laid first by this great warrior-nation, which held in

contempt all mechanical trades, and in absolute hatred the peaceful life of shepherds. From Egypt art passes directly into Greece, where all poetry, and all painting, are nothing else than the description, praise, or dramatic representation of war, or of the exercises which prepare for it, in their connection with offices of religion. All Greek institutions had first respect to war; and their conception of it, as one necessary office of all human and divine life, is expressed simply by the images of their guiding gods. Apollo is the god of all wisdom of the intellect; he bears the arrow and the bow, before he bears the lyre. Again, Athena is the goddess of all wisdom in conduct. Yet it is by the helmet and the shield, oftener than by the shuttle, that she is distinguished from other deities.

The Greeks represent quite the highest rank of wise manhood. We have derived all our great arts and thoughts from them.

There were, however, two great differences in principles between the Greek and the Egyptian theories of policy. In Greece there was no soldier caste; every citizen was necessarily a soldier. And, again, while the Greeks rightly despised mechanical arts as much as the Egyptians, they did not make the fatal mistake of despising agricultural and pastoral life; but perfectly honoured both. These two conditions of truer thought raise them quite into the highest rank of wise manhood that has yet been reached; for all our great arts, and nearly all our great thoughts, have been borrowed or derived from them. Take away from us what they have given; aud I hardly can imagine how low the modern European would stand.

But the art-instinct also is required, along with war, to produce art. The exercises of war were practical with the Romans. They had no artinstinct. It is only with Gothic chivalry, with its delight in war for its own sake, that art is born again.

Now, you are to remember, in passing to the next phase of history, that though you *must* have war to produce art—you must also have much more than war; namely, an art-instinct or genius in the people; and that, though all the talent for painting in the world won't make painters of you, unless you have a gift for fighting as well, you may have the gift for fighting, and none for painting. Now, in the next great dynasty of soldiers, the art-instinct is wholly wanting. I have not yet investigated the Roman character enough to tell you the causes of this ; but I believe, paradoxical as it may seem to you, that, however truly the Roman might say of himself that he was born of Mars, and suckled by the wolf, he was nevertheless, at heart, more of a farmer than a soldier. The exercises of war were with him practical, not poetical ; his poetry was in domestic life only, and the object of battle, *pacis imponere morem*. And the arts are extinguished in his hands, and do not rise again, until, with Gothic chivalry, there comes back into the mind of Europe a passionate delight in war itself, for the sake of war. And then, with the romantic knighthood which can imagine no other noble employment,—under the fighting kings of France, England, and Spain ; and under the fighting dukeships and citizenships of Italy, art is born again, and rises to her height in the great valleys of Lombardy and Tuscany, through which there flows not a single stream, from all their Alps or Apennines, that did not once run dark red from battle; and it reaches its culminating glory in the city which gave to history the most intense type of

soldiership yet seen among men ;—the city whose armies were led in their assault by their king, led through it to victory by their king, and so led, though that king of theirs was blind, and in the extremity of his age.

Later, as peace is established in Europe, the arts decline.

And from this time forward, as peace is established or extended in Europe, the arts decline. They reach an unparalleled pitch of costliness, but lose their lives, enlist themselves at last on the side of luxury and various corruption, and, among wholly tranquil nations, wither utterly away; remaining only in partial practice among races who, like the French and us, have still the minds, though we cannot all live the lives, of soldiers.

The Arts are not valuable except as the expression of the highest states of the human spirit. And war is primarily the foundation of these high virtues and faculties.

"It may be so," I can suppose that a philanthropist might exclaim. "Perish then the arts, if they can flourish only at such a cost. What worth is there in toys of canvas and stone, if compared to the joy and peace of artless domestic life ?" And the answer is—truly, in themselves, none. But as expressions of the highest state of the human spirit, their worth is infinite. As results they may be worthless, but, as signs, they are above price. For it is an assured truth that, whenever the faculties of men are at their fullness, they *must* express themselves by art ; and to say that a state is without such expression, is to say that it is sunk from its proper level of manly nature. So that, when I tell you that war is the foundation of all the arts, I mean also that it is the foundation of all the high virtues and faculties of men.

History teaches us that great nations were ennobled by war and corrupted by peace.

It was very strange to me to discover this; and very dreadful—but I saw it to be quite an undeniable fact. The common notion that peace and the virtues of civil life flourished together, I found to be wholly untenable. Peace and the *vices* of civil life only flourish together. We talk of peace and learning, and of peace and plenty, and of peace and civilisation; but I found that those were not the words which the Muse of History coupled together; that, on her lips, the words were—peace and sensuality, peace and selfishness, peace and corruption, peace and death. I found, in brief, that all great nations learned their truth of word, and strength of thought, in war; that they were nourished in war, and wasted by peace; taught by war, and deceived by peace; trained by war, and betrayed by peace;—in a word, that they were born in war, and expired in peace.

But it is not of all war that this can be said. It can only be said of three types of war; (a) War indulged in for the sake of exercise or play; (b) War fought in order to conquer surrounding evil; (c) War fought in the defence of noble institutions and pure households. These three types ennoble the people.

Yet now note carefully, in the second place, it is not *all* war of which this can be said—nor all dragon's teeth, which, sown, will start up into men. It is not the ravage of a barbarian wolf-flock, as under Genseric or Suwarrow: nor the habitual restlessness and rapine of mountaineers, as on the old borders of Scotland; nor the occasional struggle of a strong peaceful nation for its life, as in the wars of the Swiss with Austria, nor the contest of merely ambitious nations for extent of power, as in the wars of France under Napoleon, or the just terminated war in America. None of these forms of war build anything but tombs. But the creative or foundational war is that in

which the natural restlessness and love of contest among men are disciplined, be consent, into modes of beautiful—though it may be fatal —play; in which the natural ambition and love of power of men are disciplined into the agressive conquest of surrounding evil ; and in which the natural instincts of self-defence are sanctified by the nobleness of the institutions, and purity of the households, which they are appointed to defend. To such war as this all men are born; in such war as this any man may happily die ; and forth from such war as this have arisen, throughout the extent of past ages, all the highest sanctities and virtues of humanity.

I shall therefore divide the war which I would speak to you into three heads. War for exercise or play, war for dominion, and, war for defence.

(a) War for exercise or play; the classes who cause or proclaim it are the brave men who are idle and who find in the passion and peril of battle some-being.

I. And first, of war for exercise or play. I speak of it primarily in this light, because, through all past history, manly war has been more an exercise than anything else, among the classes who cause, and proclaim it. It is not a game to the conscript, or the pressed sailor; but neither of these are the causers of it. To the governor who determines that war shall be, and to the youths who voluntarily adopt it as their profession, it has always been a grand pastime; and chiefly pursued because they had nothing else to do. And this is true without any exception. No king whose mind was fully occupied with the development of the inner resources of his kingdom, or with any other sufficing subject of thought, ever entered into war but on com-

pulsion. No youth who was earnestly busy with any peaceful subject of study, or set on any serviceable course of action, ever voluntarily became a soldier. Occupy him, early and wisely, in agriculture or business, in science or in literature, and he will never think of war otherwise than as a calamity. But leave him idle; and, the more brave and active and capable he is by nature, the more he will thirst for some appointed field for action; and find, in the passion and peril of battle, the only satisfying fulfilment of his unoccupied belong. And from the earliest incipient civilisation until now, the population of the earth divides itself, when you look at it widely, into two races; one of workers, and the other of players—one tilling the ground, manufacturing, building, and otherwise providing for the necessities of life;—the other part proudly idle, and continually therefore needing recreation, in which they use the productive and laborious orders partly as their cattle, and partly as their puppets or pieces in the game of death.

But there is no virtue in the game of war when it is played with a multitude of human pawns. Again, gentlemen should lay it on their own heads rather than engage peasants to fight for them. Women might sit as queens above duels but not encourage wars where millions are slain.

Now, remember, whatever virtue or goodliness there may be in this game of war, rightly played, there is none when you thus play it with a multitude of small human pawns.

If you, the gentlemen of this or any other kingdom, choose to make your pastime of contest, do so, and welcome; but set not up these unhappy peasant-pieces upon the green fielded board. If the wager is to be of death, lay it on your own heads, not theirs. A goodly struggle in the Olympic dust, though it be the dust of the grave, the gods will look upon, and

be with you in ; but they will not be with you, if you sit on the side of the amphitheatre, whose steps are the mountains of earth. whose arena its valleys, to urge your peasant millions into gladiatorial war You also, you tender and delicate women, for whom, and by whose command, all true battle has been, and must ever be ; you would perhaps shrink now, though you need not. from the thought of sitting as queens above set lists where the jousting game might be mortal. How much more, then, ought you to shrink from the thought of sitting above a theatre pit in which even a few condemned slaves were slaying each other only for your delight ! And do you *not* shrink from the *fact* of sitting above a theatre pit, where,—not condemned slaves,—but the best and bravest of the poor sons of your people, slay each other,—not man to man,—as the coupled gladiators ; but race to race, in duel of generations ? You would tell me, perhaps, that you do not sit to see this ; and it indeed true, that the women of Europe—those who have no heart-interest of their own at peril in the contest—draw the curtains of their boxes, and muffle the openings ; so that from the pit of the circus of slaughter there may reach them only at intervals a half-heard cry and a murmur of the wind's sighing, when myriads of soul expire. They shut out the death-cries ; and are happy, and talk wittily among themselves. That is the utter literal fact of what our ladies do in their pleasant lives.

Nay, you might answer, speaking for them —"We do not let these wars come to pass

You may say that quarrels between nations can only be stettled by war. Even if this is granted. is it always necessary to put your quarrel into the hearts of the poor and to sign your treaties with peasanr's blood ?

for our play, nor by our carelessness ; we cannot help them. How can any final quarrel of nations be settled otherwise than by war ?" I cannot now delay, to tell you how political quarrels might be otherwise setteld. But grant that they cannot. Grant that no law of reason can be understood by nations ; no law of justice submitted to by them : and that, while questions of a few acres, and of petty cash, can be determined by truth and equity, the questions which are to issue in the perishing or saving of kingdoms can be determined only by the truth of the sword, and the equity of the rifle. Grant this, and even then, judge if it will always be necessary for you to put your quarrel into the hearts of your poor, and sign your treaties with peasants' blood. You would be ashamed to do this in your own private position and power. Why should you not be ashamed also to do it in public place and and power ? If you quarrel with your neighbour, and the quarrel be indeterminable by law, and mortal, you and he do not send your footmen to Battersea fields to fields it out; nor do you set fire to his tenants' cottages, nor spoil their goods You fight out your quarrel yourselves, and at your own danger, if at all. And you do not think it materially affects the arbitrement that one of you has a larger household than the other; so that, if the servants or tenants were brought into the field with their masters, the issue of the contest could not be doubtful? You either refuse the private duel, or you practise it under laws of honour, not of physical force ; that so it may be, in a manner,

justly concluded. Now the just or unjust conclusion of the private feud is of little moment, while the just or unjust conclusion of the public feud is of eternal moment : and yet, in this public quarrel, you take your servants' sons from their arms to fight for it, and your servants' food from their lips to support it ; and the black seals on the parchment of your treaties of peace are the deserted hearth and the fruitless field. There is a ghastly ludicrousness in this, as there is mostly in these wide and universal crimes. Hear the statement of the very fact of it in the most literal words of the greatest of our English thinkers :—

Carlyle condemns was on same groudn, quotig an imaginary instance of thirty Frenchmen and thirity Englishmen killing one another simply because their governors hid fallen ous·

"What, speaking in quite unofficial language, is the net-purport and upshot of war? To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the British village of Dumdrudge; usually some five-hundred souls. From those, by certain 'natural enemies' of the French there are successively selected, during the French war, say thirty able-bodied men. Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them ; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts, so that one can weave, another build, another hammer, and the weakest can stand under thirty stone avoirdupois. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected ; all dressed in red ; and shipped away, at the public charges, some, two thousand miles, or say only to the south of Spain ; and fed there till wanted.

"And now to that same spot in the south of Spain are thirty similar French artisans, from

a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending; till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxta-position; and Thirty stands fronting Thirty, each with a gun in his hand.

"Straightway the word 'Fire!' is given, and they blow the souls out of one another, and in place of sixty brisk useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcases, which it must bury, and anon shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their governors had fallen out; and instead of shoting one another, had the cunning to make these poor block-heads shoot." (*Sartor Resartus.*)

The game of battle should be played, but in another way. Fair fight, with its sense of danger, is the best play for all healthy mrn to play and for all brave women to hear of. We would like a valiant person to make his bread by thrusting rather than by batting, by slaying rather than by cheating.

Positively, then, gentlemen, the game of battle must not, and shall not, ultimately be played this way. But should it be played any way? Should it, if not by your servants, be practised by yourselves? I think; yes. Both history and human instinct seem alike to say yes. All healthy men like fighting, and like the sense of danger; all brave women like to hear of their fighting, and of their facing danger. This is a fixed instinct in the fine race of them; and I cannot help fancying that fair fight is the best play for them; and that a tournament was a better game than a steeplechase. The time may perhaps come in France as well as here, for universal hurdle-races and cricketing: but I do not think universal "crickets" will bring out

the best qualities of the nobles of either country. I use, in such question, the test which I have adopted, of the connection of war with other arts; and I reflect how, as a sculptor, I should feel, if I were asked to design a monument for a dead knight, in Westminster Abbey, with a carving of a bat at one end, and a ball at the other. It may be the remains in me only of savage Gothic prejudice; but I had rather carve it with a shield at one end, and a sword at the other. And this, observe, with no reference whatever to any story of duty done, or cause defended. Assume the knight merely to have ridden out occasionally to fight his neighbour for exercise; assume him even a soldier of fortune, and to have gained his bread, and filled his purse, at the sword's point. Still, I feel as if it were, somehow, grander and worthier in him to have made his bread by sword play than any other play; I had rather he had made it by thrusting than by batting:—much more, than by betting. Much rather that he should ride war horses, than back race horses; and—I say it sternly and deliberately—much rather would I have him slay his neighbour, than cheat him.

The game of war is the only game in which the full personal power of the human creature is brought out in management of its weapons. This is so because—firstly, it determines who is the best man, when well

But remember, so far as this may be true, the game of war is only that in which the *full personal power of the human creature* is brought out in management of its weapons. And this for three reasons:—

First, the great justification of this game is that it truly, when well played, determines *who is the best man*;—who is the highest bred, the most self-denying, the most fearless, the

played. as there is a possibility of the struggle ending in death;

coolest of nerve, the swiftest of eye and hand. You cannot test these qualities wholly, unless there is a clear possibility of the struggle's ending in death It is only in the fronting of that condition that the full trial of the man, soul and body, comes out. You may go to your game of wickets, or of hurdles, or of cards, and any knavery that is in you may stay unchallenged all the while But if the play may be ended at any moment by a lance-thrust, a man will probably make up his accounts a little before he enters it. Whatever is rotten and evil in him will weaken his hand more in holding a sword hilt, than in balancing a billiard cue; and on the whole, the habit of living lightly hearted, in daily presence of death, always has had, and must have, a tendency both to the making and testing of honest men. But for the final testing, observe, you must make the issue of battle strictly dependent on fineness of frame, and firmness of hand. You must not make it the question, which of the combatants has the longest gun, or which has got behind the biggest tree, or which has the wind in his face, or which has gunpowder made by the best chemists, or iron smelted with the best coal, or the angriest mob at his back. Decide your battle, whether of nations or individuals, on *those* terms;—and you have only multiplied confusion, and added slaughter to iniquity. But decide your battle by pure trial which has the strongest arm, and steadiest heart,—and you have gone far to decide a great many matters besides, and to decide them rightly.

And the other reasons for this mode of decision of cause, are the diminution both of the material destructiveness, or cost, and of the physical distress of war. For you must not think that in speaking to you in this, (as you may imagine,) fantastic praise of battle, I have overlooked the conditions weighing against me. I pray all of you, who have not read, to read with the most earnest attention, Mr. Helps' two essays, on War, and Government, in the first volume of the last series of *Friends in Council.* Everything that can be urged against war is there simply, exhaustively, and most graphically stated. And all, there urged, is true. But the two great counts of evil alleged against war by that most thoughtful writer, hold only against modern war. If you have to take away masses of men from all industrial employment,—to feed them by the labour of others,—to move them and provide them with destructive machines, varied daily in national rivalship of inventive cost; if you have to ravage the country which you attack,—to destroy, for a score of future years, its roads, its woods, its cities and its harbours;—and if, finally, having brought masses of men, counted by hundreds of thousands, face to face, you tear those masses to pieces with jagged shot, and leave the fragments of living creatures, countlessly beyond all help of surgery, to starve and parch, through days of torture, down into clots of clay—what book of account shall record the cost of your work;—What book of judgment sentence the guilt of it?

and secondly and thirdly, this mode of decision of cause diminishes material destructiveness and physical distress.

War in the pagan days was far more humane.

That, I say, is *modern* war,—scientific war, —chemical and mechanic war,—worse even than the savage's poisoned arrow. And yet you will tell me, perhaps, that any other war than this is impossible now It may be so; the progress of science cannot, perhaps, be otherwise registered than by new facilities of destruction; and the brotherly love of our enlarging Christianity be only proved by multiplication of murder. Yet hear, for a moment, what war was, in Pagan and ignorant days;—what war might yet be, if we could extinguish our science in darkness, and join the heathen's practice to the Christian's theory. I read you this from a book which probably most of you know well, and all ought to know—Muller's *Dorians*;—but I have put the points I wish you to remember in closer connection than in his text.

The conduct of the Spartans in battle, for instance, denotes a high and noble disposition.

"The chief characteristic of the warriors of Sparta was great composure and a subdued strength; the violence (   ) of Aristodemus and Isadas being considered as deserving rather of blame than praise and these qualities in general distinguished the Greeks from the northern Barbarians, whose boldness always consisted in noise and tumult. For the same reason the Spartans *sacrificed to the Muses* before an action; these goddesses being expected to produce regularity and order in battle; as they *sacrificed on the same occasion in Crete to the god of love*, as the confirmer of mutual esteem and shame. Every man put on a crown, when the band of flute-players gave the signal for attack; all the shields of the line glittered with their high polish, and mingled their splendour with the dark red

the purple mantles, which were meant both to adorn the combatant, and to conceal the blood of the wounded; to fall well and decorously being an incentive the more to the most heroic valour. The conduct of the Spartans in battle denotes a high and noble disposition, which rejected all the extremes of b. utal rage. The pursuit of the enemy ceased when the victory was completed ; and after the signal for retreat had been given, all hostilities ceased. The spoiling of arms, at least during the battle, was also interdicted ; and the consecration of the spoils of slain enemies to the gods, as, in general, all rejoicings for victory, were considered as ill-omened."

The calamitous nature of modern warfare contrasts glaringly with it.

Such was the war of the greatest soldiers who prayed to heathen gods. What Christian war is, preached by Christian ministers, let any one tell you, who saw the sacred crowning, and heard the sacred flute-playing, and was inspired and sanctified by the divinely-measured and musical language, of any North American regiment preparing for its charge. And what is the relative cost of life in pagan and Christian wars, let this one fact tell you :—the Spartans won the decisive battle of Corinth with the loss of eight men ; the victors at indecisive Gettysburg confess to the loss of 30,000.

(b) War for dominion.

II. I pass now to our second order of war, the commonest among men, that undertaken in desire of dominion. And let me ask you to think for a few moments what the real meaning of this desire of dominion is—first in the minds of kings—then in that of nations.

Human nature is a noble and beautiful thing.

Now, mind you this first,—that I speak either about kings, or masses of men, with a fixed conviction that human nature is a noble and beautiful thing; not a foul nor a baset hing. All the sin of men I esteem as their disease, not their nature ; as a folly which may be prevented, not a necessity which must be accepted. And my wonder, even when things are at their worst, is always at the height which this human nature can attain. Thinking it high, I find it always a higher thing than I thought it ; while those who think it low, find it, and will find it, always, lower than they thought it . the fact being, that it is infinite, and capable of infinite height and infinite fall ; but the nature of it—and here is the faith which I would have you hold with me—the *natu.e* of it is in the nobleness, not in the catastrophe.

The Captain of the *London* behaved naturally and the mother of the two-year old-child unnaturally. We naturally cling more and more to nobleness and virtue.

Take the faith in its utmost terms. When the captain of the *London* shook hands with his mate, saying, "God speed you ! I will go down with my passengers," *that* I believe to be "human nature" He does not do it from any religious motive,—from any hope of reward, or any fear of punishment ; he does it because he is a man. But when a mother, living among the fair fields of merry England, gives her two-year-old child to be suffocated under a mattress in her inner room, while the said mother waits and talks outside ; *that* I believe to be *not* human nature. You have the two extremes there, shortly. And you, men, and mothers, who are here face to face with me to-night, I call upon you to say

which of these is human, and which "inhuman,"—which "natural" and which "unnatural"? Choose your creed at once, I beseech you:—choose it with unshaken choice,—choose it for ever. Will you take, for foundation of act and hope, the faith that this man was such as God made him, or that this woman was such as God made her? Which of them has failed from their nature,—from their present, possible, actual nature;-not their nature of long ago, but their nature of now? Which has betrayed it—falsified it? Did the guardian who died in his trust, die inhumanly, and as a fool; and did the murderess of her child fulfil the law of her being? Choose, I say; infinitude of choices hang upon this You have had false prophets among you,—for centuries you have had them,—solemnly warned against them though you were; false prophets, who have told you that all men are nothing but fiends or wolves, half beast, half devil. Believe that, and indeed you may sink to that. But refuse that, and have faith that God "made you upright," though *you* have sought out many inventions; so, you will strive daily to become more what your Maker meant and means you to be, and daily gives you also the power to be,—and you will cling more and more to the nobleness and virtue that is in you, saying, "My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go."

A perfect human being is invariably both kind and true.

I have put this to you as a choice, as if you might hold either of these creeds you liked best. But there is in reality no choice for you; the facts being quite easily ascertainable. You have no business to *think* about this matter, or

to choose in it. The broad fact is, that a human creature of the highest race, and most perfect as a human thing, is invariably both kind and true; and that as you lower the race, you get cruelty and falseness, as you get deformity: and this so steadily and assuredly, that the two great words which, in their first use, meant only perfection of race, have come, by consequence of the invariable connection of virtue with the fine human nature, both to signify benevolence of disposition. The word generous, and the word gentle, both, in their origin, meant only "of pure race," but because charity and tenderness are inseparable from this purity of blood, the words which once stood only for pride, now stand as synonyms for virtue.

But it is inconceivable how, in spite of all this, princes and noblemen, who ought to be the gentlest of the gentle continue to oppress the people and pervert justice. The ordinary seacaptain goes down to his grave with his passengers but the king—the captain by divine right—thinks only of the ways and means of taxing his people.

Now, this being the true power of our inherent humanity, and seeing that all the aim of education should be to develop this;—and seeing also what magnificent self-sacrifice the higher classes of men are capable of, for any cause that they understand or feel,—it is wholly inconceivable to me how well-educated princes, who ought to be of all gentlemen the gentlest, and of all nobles the most generous, and whose title of royalty means only their function of doing every man "*right*"—how these, I say throughout history, should so rarely pronounce themselves on the side of the poor and of justice, but continually maintain themselves and their own interests by oppression of the poor, and by wresting of justice; and how this should be accepted as so natural, that the word loyalty, which means faithfulness to low, is used as if

it were only the duty of a people to be loyal to their king, and not the duty of a king to be infinitely more loyal to his people. How comes it to pass that a captain will die with his passengers, and lean over the gunwale to give the parting boat its course ; but that a king will not usually die with, much less *for*, his passengers —thinks it rather incumbent on his passengers, in any number, to die for *him* ? Think, I beseech you, of the wonder of this. The sea captain, not captain by divine right, but only by company's appointment ;—not a man of royal descent, but only a plebeian who can steer ;—not with the eyes of the world upon him, but with feeble chance, depending on one poor boat, of his name being ever heard above the wash of the fatal waves ;—not with the cause of a nation resting on his act, but helpless to save so much as a child from among the lost crowd with whom he resolves to be lost,—yet goes down quietly to his grave, rather than break his faith to these few emigrants. But your captain by divine right,—your captain with the hues of a hundred shields of kings upon his breast,—your captain whose every deed, brave or base, will be illuminated or branded for ever before unescapable eyes of men,—your captain whose every thought and act are beneficent, or fatal, from sunrising to setting, blessing as the sunshine, or shadowing as the night,—this captain, as you find him in history, for the most part thinks only how he may tax his passengers, and sit at most ease in his state cabin !

If the rulers were desirous of working for the welfare of their people, they would find no time for war for the sake of mere increase of power. But if the rulers just love authority and nothing else, they will try to add illimitably to their territory,—though it will hardly stand them in good stead to do so.

For observe, if there had been indeed in the hearts of the rulers of great multitudes of men any such conception of work for the good of those under their command, as there is in the good and thoughtful masters of any small company of men, not only wars for the sake of mere increase of power could never take place, but our idea of power itself would be entirely altered Do you suppose that to think and act even for a million of men, to hear their complaints, watch their weaknesses, restrain their vices, make laws for them, lead them, day by day, to purer life, is not enough for one man's work ? If any of us were absolute lord only of a district of a hundred miles square, and were resloved on doing our utmost for it ; making it feed as large a number of people as possible ; making every clod productive, and every rock defensive, and every human being happy ; should we not have enough on our hands, think you ? But if the ruler has any other aim than this ; if, careless of the result of his interference, he desire only the authority to interfere ; and, regardless of what is ill-done or well-done, cares only that it shall be done at his bidding ;—if he would rather do two hundred miles' space of mischief, than one hundred miles' space of good, of course he will try to add to his territory ; and to add illimitably. But does he add to his power ? Do you call it power in a child, if he is allowed to play with the wheels and bands of some vast engine, pleased with their murmur and whirl, till his unwise touch, wandering where it ought not, scatters beam and wheel

into ruin? Yet what machine is so vast, so incognisable, as the working of the mind of a nation; what child's touch so wanton, as the word of a selfish king? And yet, how long have we allowed the historian to speak of the extent of the calamity a man causes, as a just ground for his pride; and to extol him as the greatest prince, who is only the centre of the widest error. Follow out this thought by yourselves; and you will find that all power, properly so called, is wise and benevolent. There may be capacity in a drifting fireship to destroy a fleet; there may be venom enough in a dead body to infect a nation:—but which of you, the most ambitious, would desire a drifting kinghood, robed in consuming fire, or a poison dipped sceptre whose touch was mortal? There is no true potency, remember, but that of help; nor true ambition, but ambition to save.

But true power does not depend either upon number of population.

And then observe farther, this true power, the power of saving, depends neither on multitude of men, nor on extent of territory. We are continually assuming that nations become strong according to their numbers. They indeed become so, if those numbers can be made of one mind; but how are you sure you can stay them in one mind, and keep them from having north and south minds? Grant them unanimous, how know you they will be unanimous in right? If they are unanimous in wrong, the more they are, essentially the weaker they are. Or, suppose that they can neither be of one mind, nor of two minds, but can only be of *no* mind? Suppose they are a mere helpless mob; tottering

into precipitant catastrophe, like a waggon load of stones when the wheel comes off. Dangerous enough for their neighbours, certainly, but not "powerful."

or upon extent of territory.

Neither does strength depend on extent of territory, any more than upon number of population. Take up your maps when you go home this evening,—put the cluster of British Isles beside the mass of South America; and then consider whether any race of men need care how much ground they stand upon. The strength is in the men, and in their unity and virtue, not in their standing room: a little group of wise hearts is better than a wilderness full of fools; and only that nation gains true territory, which gains itself.

No government is ultimately strong, but in proportion to its kindness and justice. And a nation multiplies strength only if its increasing numbers live in perfect fellowship and brotherhood. Extension of dominion in mere desire of dominion is perilous But more perilous and even dastardly and malignant is our principle of non.intervention where we know our authority would be helpful and protective.

And now for the brief practical outcome of all this Remember, no government is ultimately strong, but in proportion to its kindness and justice; and that a nation does not strengthen, by merely multiplying and diffusing itself. We have not strengthened as yet, by multiplying into America. Nay, even when it has not to encounter the separating conditions of emigration, a nation need not boast itself of multiplying on its own ground, if it multiplies only as flies or locusts do, with the god of flies for its god. It multiplies its strength only by increasing as one great family, in perfect fellowship and brotherhood. And lastly, it does not strengthen itself by seizing dominion over races whom it cannot benefit. Austria is not strengthened, but weakened, by her grasp of Lombardy; and whatever apparent increase of majesty and of wealth may have accrued to

us from the possession of India, whether these prove to us ultimately power or weakness, depends wholly on the degree in which our influence on the native race shall be benevolent and exalting. But, as it is at their own peril that any race extends their dominion in mere desire of power, so it is at their own still greater peril that they refuse to undertake aggressive war, according to their force, whenever they are assured that their authority would be helpful and protective. Nor need you listen to any sophistical objection of the impossibility of knowing when a people's help is needed, or when not. Make your national conscience clean, and your national eyes will soon be clear. No man who is truly ready to take part in a noble quarrel will ever stand long in doubt by whom, or in what cause, his aid is needed. I hold it my duty to make no political statement of any special bearing in this presence; but I tell you broadly and boldly, that, within these last ten years, we English have, as a knightly nation, lost our spurs; we have fought where we should not have fought, for gain; and we have been passive where we should not have been passive, for fear. I tell you that the principle of non-intervention, as now preached among us, is as selfish and cruel as the worst frenzy of conquest, and differs from it only by being, not only malignant, but dastardly.

I know, however, that my opinions on this subject differ too widely from those ordinarily held, to be any farther intruded upon you; and therefore I pass lastly to examine the conditions

(c) War waged for defence of the country. You become soldiers because,

as boys, you love adventure, excitement, fine dress and fame. You have put yourselves into the hand of your country as its weapon. You have vowed to be its slaves. But would you be satisfied with becoming the servants of shop-keepers and the police of manufacturing towns?

of the third kind of noble war;—war waged simply for defence of the country in which we were born, and for the maintenance and execution of her laws, by whomsoever threatened or defied. It is to this duty that I suppose most men entering the army consider themselves in reality to be bound, and I want you now to reflect what the laws of mere defence are; and what the soldier's duty, as now understood, or supposed to be understood. You have solemnly devoted yourselves to be English soldiers, for the guardianship of England. I want you to feel what this vow of yours indeed means, or is gradually coming to mean. You take it upon you, first, while you are sentimental schoolboys; you go into your military convent, or barracks, just as a girl goes into her convent while she is a sentimental schoolgirl; neither of you then know what you are about, though both the good soldiers and good nuns make the best of it afterwards. You don't understand perhaps why I call you "sentimental" schoolboys, when you go into the army? Because, on the whole, it is the love of adventure, of excitement, of fine dress and of the pride of fame, all which are sentimental motives, which chiefly make a boy like going into the Guards better than into a counting-house. You bancy, perhaps, that there is a severe sense of duty mixed with these peacocky motives? And in the best of you, there is; but do not think that it is principal. If you cared to do your duty to your country in a prosaic and unsentimental way, depend upon it, there is now truer duty to be done in raising harvests, than in burning them; more in building

houses, than in shelling them—more in winning money by your own work, wherewith to help men, than in taxing other people's work, for money wherewith to slay men;—more duty finally, in honest and unselfish living than in honest and unselfish dying, though that seems to your boy's eyes the bravest. So far then, as for your own honour. and the honour of your families, you choose brave death in a red coat before brave life in a black one, you are sentimental ; and now see what this passionate vow of yours comes to. For a little while you ride, and you hunt tigers or savages, you shoot, and are shot; you are happy, and proud, always, and honoured and wept if you die ; and you are satisfied with your life, and with the end of it ; believing, on the whole, that good rather than harm of it comes to others, and much pleasure to you But as the sense of duty enters into your forming minds, the vow takes another aspect. You find that you have put yourselves into the hand of your country as a weapon. You have vowed to strike, when she bids you, and to stay scabbarded when she bids you ; all that you need answer for is, that you fail not in her grasp. And there is goodness in this, and greatness, if you can trust the hand and heart of the Britomart who has braced you to her side, and are assured that when she leaves you sheathed in darkness, there is no need for your flash to the sun. But remember, good and noble as this state may be, it is a state of slavery. There are different kinds of slaves and different masters. Some slaves are scourged to their work by whips, others are scourged to it by

restlessness or ambition. It does not matter what the whip is; it is none the less a whip, because you have cut thongs for it out of your own souls: the fact, so far, of slavery, is in being driven to your work without thought, at another's bidding. Again, some slaves are bought with money, and others with praise. It matters not what the purchase-money is. The distinguishing sign of slavery is to have a price, and be bought for it. Again, it matters not what kind of work you are set on; some slaves are set to forced diggings, others to forced marches; some dig furrows, others field-works, and others graves. Some press the juice of reeds, and some the juice of vines, and some the blood of men. The fact of the capitivity is the same whatever work we are set upon, though the fruits of the toil may be different. But, remember, in thus vowing ourselves to be the slaves of any master, it ought to be some subject of forethought with us, what work he is likely to put us upon. You may think that the whole duty of a soldier is to be passive, that it is the country you have left behind who is to command, and you have only to obey. But are you sure that you have left *all* your country behind, or that the part of it you have so left is indeed the best part of it? Suppose—and, remember, it is quite conceivable—that you yourselves are indeed the best part of England; that you, who have become the slaves, ought to have been the masters; and that those who are the masters, ought to have been the slaves! If it is a noble and whole-hearted England, whose bidding you are bound to do, it is well;

but if you are yourselves the best of her heart, and the England you have left be but a half-hearted England, how say you of your obedience? You were too proud to become shop-keepers: are you satisfied then to become the servants of shop-keepers? You were too proud to become merchants or farmers yourselves: will you have merchants or farmers, then, for your field-marshals? You had no gifts of special grace for Exeter Hall: will you have some gifted person thereat for your commander-in-chief, to judge of your work, and reward it? You imagine yourselves to be the army of England : how if you should find yourselves; at last, only the police of her manufacturing towns, and the beadles of her little Bethels?

It is not so yet, nor will be so, I trust, for ever ; but what I want you to see, and to be assured of, is, that the ideal of soldiership is not mere passive obedience and bravery ; that, so far from this, no country is in a healthy state which has separated, even in a small degree, her civil from her military power. All states of the world, however great, fall at once when they use mercenary armies; and although it is a less instant form of error, (because involving no national taint of cowardice), it is yet an error no less ultimately fatal—it is the error especially of modern times, of which we cannot yet know all the calamitous consequences,—to take away the best blood and strength of the nation, all the soul-substance of it that is brave, and careless of reward, and scornful of pain, and faithful in trust; and to cast that into steel, and make a mere sword of it; taking away its voice

No country is in a healthy state which was separated her civil from her military power and which has turned soldiership into passive obedience, giving the cowardly part of the nation the chief authority. No soldier is bound to defend a state without virtue, laws and honour

and will ; but to keep the worst part of the nation—whatever is cowardly, avaricious, sensual, and faithless—and to give to this the voice, to this the authority, to this the chief privilege, where there is least capacity, of thought. The fulfilment of your vow for the defence of England will by no means consist in carrying out such a system. You are not true soldiers, if you only mean to stand at a shop door, to protect shop-boys who are cheating inside. A soldier's vow to his country is that he will die for the guardianship of her domestic virtue, of her righteous laws, and of her any-way challenged or endangered honour. A state without virtue, without laws, and without honour, he is bound *not* to defend; nay, bound to redress by his own right hand that which he sees to be base in her. So sternly is this the law of Nature and life, that a nation once utterly corrupt can only be redeemed by a military despotism—never by talking, nor by its free effort. And the health of any state consists simply in this ; that in it, those who are wisest shall also be strongest ; its rulers should be also its soldiers ; or, rather, by force of intellect more than of sword, its soldiers also its rulers. Whatever the hold which the aristocracy of England has on the heart of England, in that they are still always in front of her battles, this hold will not be enough, unless they are also in front of her thoughts. And truly her thoughts need good captain's leading now, if ever ! Do you know what, by this beautiful division of labour (her brave men fighting, and her cowards thinking), she was

The health of a nation is intact when its wisest are also its Strongest men, and its rulers, also its soldiers. England does not owe her present supremacy to the cheapness of her coal but rather to the virtues still practised by some of her sons soldiers must teach this lesson to the country.

come at last to think ? Here is a bit of a paper in my hand,* a good one too, and an honest one ; quite representative of the best common public thought of England at this moment; and it is holding forth in one of its leaders upon our "social welfare."—upon our "vivid life"—upon the "political supremacy of Great Britain." And what do you think all these are owning to ? To what our English sires have done for us, and taught us, age after age ? No not to that. To our honesty of heart, or coolness of head, or steadiness of will ? No; not to these. To our thinkers, or our statesmen, or our poets, or our captains, or our martyrs, or the patient labour of our poor ? No ; not to these ; or at least not to these in any chief measure. Nay, says the journal, [illegible] than any agency, it is the cheapness and abundance, of our coal which

*I do not care to refer to the journal quoted, because the article was unworthy of its general tone, though in order to enable the audience to verify the quoted sentence, I left the number containing it on the table, when I gave this lecture. But a saying of Baron Liebig's, quoted at the head of a leader on the same subject in the *Daily Telegraph* of January 11. 1866, summarily digests and presents the maximum folly of modern thought in this respect. "Civilisation" says the Baron, "is the economy of power, and English power is coal." Not altogether so, my chemical friend. Civilisation is the making of civil persons, which is a kind of distillation of which alembics are incapable, and does not at all imply the turning of a small company of gentlemen into a large company of ironmon, gers. And English power, (what little of it may be left) is by no means coal, but. indeed, of that which, "when the whole world turns to coal, then chiefly. lives."

have made us what we are." If it be so, then "ashes to ashes" be our epitaph! and the sooner the better. I tell you, Gentlemen of England, if ever you would have your country breathe the pure breath of heaven again, and receive again a soul into her body, instead of rotting into a carcase, blown up in the belly with carbonic acid (and great *that* way), you must think, and feel, for your England, as well as fight for her. you must teach her that all the true greatness she ever had, or ever can have, she won while her fields were green and her faces ruddy;—that greatness is still possible for Englishmen, even though the ground be not hollow under their feet, nor the sky black over their heads;—and that, when the day comes for their country to lay her honours in the dust, her crest will not rise from it more loftily because it is dust of coal. Gentlemen, I tell you, solemnly, that the day is coming when the soldiers of England must be her tutors; and the captains of her army, captains also of her mind.

A youth cannot afford to be thoughtless, for the whole of his future depends on the decisions he is going to take. One might excuse the thoughtlessness oldage.

And now, remember, you soldier youths, who are thus in all ways the hope of your country; or must be, if she have any hope; remember that your fitness for all future trust depends upon what you are now. No good soldier in his old age was ever careless or indolent in his youth. Many a giddy and thoughtless boy has become a good bishop, or a good lawyer, or good merchant; but no such an one ever became a good general. I challenge you, in all history, to find a record of a good soldier who was not grave and earnest in his youth. And, in general, I have no patience

with people who talk about "the thoughtlessness of youth" indulgently. I had infinitely rather hear of thoughtless old age, and the indulgence due to *that*. When a man has done his work, and nothing can any way be materially altered in his fate, let him forget his toil, and jest with his fate, if he will ; but what excuse can you find for wilfulness of thought, at the very time when every crisis of future fortune hangs on your decisions ? A youth thoughtless ! when all the happiness of his home for ever depends on the chances, or the passions, of an hour ! A youth thoughtless ! when the career of all his days depends on the opportunity of a moment ! A youth thoughtless ! when his every act is a foundation-stone of future conduct, and every imagination a fountain of life death ! Be thoughtless in *any* after years, rather than now—though, indeed, there is only one place where a man may be nobly thoughtless,—his deathbed. No thinking should ever be left to be done there.

All the sons of England owe two duties to their country : industry and honour. The sin of idleness in soldiers is a thousand fold greater than in other youths. And the vilest form of idleness is betting.

Having, then, resolved that you will not waste recklessly, but earnestly use, these early days of yours, remember that all the duties of her children to England may be summed in two words—industry, and honour. I say first, industry, for it is in this that soldier youth are especially tempted to fail. Yet, surely there is no reason, because your life may possibly or probably be shorter than other men's, that you should therefore waste more recklessly the portion of it that is granted you ; neither do the duties of your profession, which require you to keep your bodies strong, in any

wise involve the keeping of your minds weak. So far from that, the experience, the hardship, and the activity of a soldier's life render his powers of thought more accurate than those of other men; and while, for others, all knowledge is often little more than a means of amusement, there is no form of science which a soldier may not at some time or other find bearing on business of life and death. A young mathematician may be excused for languor in studying curves to be described only with a pencil; but not in tracing those which are to be described with a rocket. Your knowledge of a wholesome herb may involve the feeding of an army; and acquaintance with an obscure point of geography, the success of a campaign. Never waste an instant's time, therefore; the sin of idleness is a thousand-fold greater in you than in other youths; for the fates of those who will one day be under your command hang upon your knowledge; lost moments now will be lost lives then, and every instant which you carelessly take for play, you buy with blood. But there is one way of wasting time, of all the vilest, because it wastes, not time only, but the interest and energy of your minds. Of all the ungentlemanly habits into which you can fall, the vilest is betting, or interesting yourselves in the issues of betting. It unites nearly every condition of folly and vice: you concentrate your interest upon a matter of chance, instead of upon a subject of true knowledge; and you back opinions which you have no grounds for forming, merely because they are your own.

All the insolence of egotism is in this ; and so far as the love of excitement is complicated with the hope of winning money, you turn yourselves into the basest sort of tradesmen--those who live by speculation. Were there no other ground for industry, this would be a sufficient one ; that it protected you from the temptation to so scandalous a vice. Work faithfully, and you will put yourselves in possession of a glorious and enlarging happiness ; not such as can be won by the speed of a horse, or marred by the obliquity of a ball.

You must also consecrate your industry by resolving to be men of honour in all things. And you must strictly maintain truth and reverence to all womanhood.

First, then, by industry you must fulfil your vow to your country ; but all industry and earnestness will be useless unless they are consecrated by your resolution to be in all things men of honour ; not honour in the common sense only, but in the highest. Rest on the force of the two main words in the great verse, *integer* vitae, scelerisque *purus*. You have vowed your life to England ; give it her wholly—a bright, stainless, perfect life—a knightly life. Because you have to fight with machines instead of lances, there may be a necessity for more ghastly danger, but there is none for less worthiness of character, than in olden time. You may be true knights yet, though perhaps not *equites* ; you may have to call yourselves "canonry" instead of "chivalry," but that is no reason why you should not call yourselves true men. So the first thing you have to see to in becoming soldiers is that you make yourselves wholly true. Courage is a mere matter of course among any ordinarily well-born youths ; but neither truth nor gentle-

ness is matter of course. You must bind them like shields about your necks; you must write them on the tables of your hearts. Though it be not exacted of you, yet exact it of yourselves, this vow of stainless truth. Your hearts are, if you leave them unstirred, as tombs in which a god lies buried. Vow yourselves crusaders to redeem that sacred sepulchre. And remember, before all things—for no other memory will be so protective of you—that the highest law of this knightly truth is that under which it is vowed to women. Whomsoever else you deceive, whomsoever you injure, whomsoever you leave unaided, you must not deceive, nor injure, nor leave unaided, according to your power, any woman of whatever rank. Believe me, every virtue of the higher phases of manly character begins in this;—in truth and modesty before the face of all maidens; in truth and pity, or truth and reverence, to all womanhood.

As for wives and maidens.—they are the souls of soldiers.

And now let me turn for a moment to you,—wives and maidens, who are the souls of soldiers; to you,—mothers, who have devoted your children to the great hierarchy of war. Let me ask you to consider what part you have to take for the aid of those who love you; for if you fail in your part they cannot fulfil theirs; such absolute helpmates you are that no man can stand without that help, nor labour in his own strength.

They should stand by soldiers heroically not only in separation, danger or

I know your hearts, and that the truth of them never fails when an hour of trial comes which you recognise for such. But you know not when the hour of trial first finds you. nor

when it verily finds you. You imagine that you are only called upon to wait and to suffer; to surrender and to mourn. You know that you must not weaken the hearts of your husbands and lovers, even by the one fear of which those hearts are capable,—the fear of parting from you, or of causing you grief. Through weary years of separation; through fearful expectancies of unknown fate; through the tenfold bitterness of the sorrow which might so easily have heen joy, and the tenfold yearning for glorious life struck down in its prime; —through all these agonies you fail not, and never will fail. But your trial is not in these. To be heroic in danger is little;—you are Englishwomen. To be heroic in change and sway of fortune is little;—for do you not love? To be patient through the great chasm and pause of loss is little,—for do you not still love in heaven? But to be heroic in happiness; to bear yourselves gravely and righteously in the dazzling of the sunshine of morning; not to forget the God in whom you trust, when He gives you most; not to fail those who trust you, when they seem to need you least; this is the difficult fortitude. It is not in the pining of absence, not in the peril of battle, not in the wasting of sickness, that your prayer should be most passionate, or your guardianship most tender. Pray, mothers and maidens, for your young soldiers in the bloom of their pride; pray for them, while the only dangers round them are in their own wayward wills; watch you, and pray, when they ahve to face, not death, but temptation. But

misfortune but also in happiness. They should guard them against temptation. The whole course of men's lives is in women's hands. A true wife is a servant in her husband's house but queen in his heart.

it is this fortitude also for which there is the crowning reward. Believe me, the whole course and character of your lovers' lives is in your hands; what you would have them be, they shall be, if you not only desire to have them so, but deserve to have them so; for they are but mirrors in which you will see yourselves imaged If you are frivolous they will be so also; if you have no understanding of the scope of their duty, they also will forget it; they will listen—they *can* listen,—to no other interpretation of it than that uttered from your lips. Bid them be brave; they will be brave for you: bid them be cowards:—and how noble soever they be;—they will quail for you. Bid them be wise, and they will be wise for you; mock at their counsel, they will be fools for you: such and so absolute is your rule over them. You fancy, perhaps, as you have been told so often, that a wife's rule should only be over her husband's house, not over his mind. Ah, no! the true rule is just the reverse of that; a true wife, in her husband's house, is his servant; it is in his heart that she is queen. Whatever of best he can conceive, it is her part to be; whatever of highest he can hope, it is hers to promise; all that is dark in him she must purge into purity; all that is failing in him she must strengthen into truth: from her, through all the world's clamour, he must win his praise: in her, through all the world's warfare, he must find his peace.

And, now, but one word more. You may wonder, perhaps, that I have spoken all this

Though I have spoken in praise of war, I would gladly see war ended for ever. But it rests mainly with the ladies of the upper classes. If they started wearing black, with no ornaments, when any cruel war proceeded no war would last a week.

night in praise of war. Yet, truly, if it might be, I for one, would fain join in the cadence of hammer-strokes that should beat swords into ploughshares . and that this cannot be, is not the fault of us men. It is *your* fault. Wholly yours. Only by your command, or by your permission, can any contest take place among us. And the real, final, reason for all the poverty, misery, and rage of battle, throughout Europe, is simply that you women, however good, however religious, however self-sacrificing for those whom you love, are too selfish and too thoughtless to take pains for any creature out of your own immediate circles. You fancy that you are sorry for the pain of others. Now I just tell you this, that if the usual course of war, instead of unroofing peasants' houses, and ravaging peasants' fields, merely broke the china upon your own drawing-room tables, no war in civilised countries would last a week. I tell you more, that at whatever moment you chose to put a period to war, you could do it with less trouble than you take any day to go out to dinner. You know, or at least you might know if you would think, that every battle you hear of has made many widows and orphans. We have, none of us, heart enough truly to mourn with these. But at least we might put on the outer symbols of mourning with them. Let but every Christian lady who has conscience toward God, vow that she will mourn, at least outwardly, for His killed creatures. Your praying is useless, and your churchgoing mere mockery of God, if you have not plain obedience in you enough for

this. Let every lady in the upper classes of civilised Europe simply vow that, while any cruel war proceeds, she will wear *black* ;—a mute's black,—with no jewel, no ornament, no excuse for, or evasion into, prettiness—I tell you again, no war would last a week.

If they led their lives according to the Bible, in justice and in simplicity, there would be no wars.

And lastly. You women of England are all now shrieking with one voice,—you and your clergymen together,—because you hear of your Bibles being attacked. If you choose to obey your Bibles, you will never care who attacks them. It is just because you never fulfil a single downright precept of the Book, that you are so careful for its credit : and just because you don't care to obey its whole words, that you are so particular about the letters of them. The Bible tells you to dress plainly,—and you are mad for finery ; the Bible tells you to have pity on the poor,—and you crush them under your carriage wheels ; the Bible tells you to do judgment and justice,—and you do not know, nor care to know, so much as what the Bible word "justice" means. Do but learn so much of God's truth as that comes to ; know what He means when He tells you to be just : and teach your sons, that their bravery is but a fool's boast, and their deeds but a firebrand's tossing, unless they are indeed Just men, and Perfect in the Fear of God ;—and you will soon have no more war, unless it be indeed such as is willed by Him, of whom, though Prince of Peace, it is also written, "In Righteousness He doth judge, and make war."

PREFACE

Preface—In later editions Ruskin substituted the word **Introduction.**

PAGE 1.

Nor any more pathetic—No other scenery could rouse more the emotions of the beholder.

By its expression—The scenery appealed to the heart of man by its suggestion of peace and purity.

Wandle—A river in Surrey, England, flowing into the Thames Ruskin has given the title *The springs of wonder* to the first chapter of *Praeterita.*

Moors—Waste lands.

Addington—District of Croydon.

Beddington—District of Surrey.

Carshalton—Urban district of Surrey. The Wandle flows through it.

Sang......lips—Flowed with a more melodious murmur, suggesting the goodness of the Creator.

"*giveth rain from heaven*—Ruskin combines two Biblical phrases : Book of Job. V. 10, "......who giveth rain upon the earth,"and *Isiah.* LV. 10,"......as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven."

Lightened......blossoming—Shone with the glory of spring flowers.

Hallowed—Made pure the heart of the passer-by.

Fain-hidden ; *full-confessed*—The compound expressions increase the suggestiveness of the phrase. Cf. Keats's "honey-feel of bliss," and "sigh-warm kisses," (*Endymion. Book I.;* 903 and 967). Notice the alliteration and see page CX of the Introduction above.

Pisan Maremma—Pisa is a town in Tuscany, Italy. It is the capital of the province of Pisa. Maremma is a marshy region of Tuscany. *Maremma*—is Italian being a corruption of the Latin "maritima"i. e. "maritime."

Campagna tomb—Campagna is the low country surrounding the city of Rome. A tomb being a symbol of death, Ruskin uses the word here to indicate the unhealthy nature of the place.

Torcellan—from Torcello, an island in the lagoons to the N. W. of Venice. It was once a flourishing city. It is known for its two famous churches.

Nor is any......appalling—The desecration of the purity and beauty of the scene is an act of impiety or blasphemy against God.

Like a body of light—Note the beauty of the simile. *Human herds*—Ruskin implies that these human beings are no better than animals, because they are lost to all sense of reverence for the beauty of nature.

PAGE 2.

Through warp......waving—Note the alliteration.

Like the chalcedony etc.—Another beautiful simile.

Chalcedony—Precious stone formed of quarts. The "chalcedony" is named from *chalcedon*, a district in ancient Asia Minor.

Moss-agate—kind of chalcedony.

Starred—with star-like flowers.

Grenouillette—kind of plant ; water crowfoot.

Shreds—Strips ; scraps.

Dig into the ground—Bury.

Gentler hands—More refined people.

Scoria—kind of lava.

Chastises to purity—Subdues it into purity ; makes it chaste or pure.

Indolent years—Years of idleness on the part of the people.

Troubled angels......Porch of Bethesda—Cf John. V. 2-4. The Biblical passage refers to a pool, by name Bethesda, in Jerusalem. It had five porches. The sick and the ailing used to gather and lie down the water of the pool, which was credited with miraculous healing properties. It was believed that at a certain season, an angel went down and stirred the water, and whoever then first stepped into it would be healed of his disease. "Troubled the water" is a Biblical phrase, occurring

in *John* V, 4. It means the stirring of the water by the angel.

PAGE 3.

Croydon– a borough of north-east Surrey, suburban to London.

High street—Name of the principal street in the town.

Public house—Inn ; tavern, providing food and lodging especially alcoholic liquors to be consumed on premises.

In so wise manner—In such a way ; Cf. "otherwise". Ruskin is speaking ironically—, the "wise" manner is really a "stupid" manner !

In old time—In the Middle Ages. Like Carlyle and William Morris, Ruskin was more in love with the Middle Ages.

PAGE 4.

Represented etc.—The iron bars were uselessly employed; and thus a good deal of human energy was wasted. One third of that work would have been enough to purify the river.

Freehold—Estate held by tenure in fee simple or fee-tail or for term of life. (Fee simple, without limitation to particular class of heirs; fee-tail, with such limitation).

Dignity of an establishment—Note the irony.

Stately arrangement– Again ironical.

Dead ground—unused ground.

Open-handed—Probably an ironical pun is intended here, since the expression usually has the sense of "liberal, generous".

Ill-taught students– Ruskin has art students in mind.

Wo k...miserable—It was all a waste and misdirection of human energy : and further this work was from beginning to end ill-conceived and its operation was a sort of poisonous and deadly labour.

Deathful—This unusual form is used, as being more intensive than the usual word, deadly.

Operative—workman.

Capitalist—A person owning capital, i.e. wealth that is used for producing more.

PAGE 5.

In the one care—i.e. in the making of iron bars.

In that function—In doing that.

Spent once for all—i.e. without earning a profit and thus adding to the original investment.

Percentage—Profit or commissions which is usually calculated on a percentage basis

Bye-ways—usually spelt "by-ways". Additional or side ways.

Filchings—Things stolen or pilfered.

Partially light pockets, to swell heavy ones—Ruskin maintains that industrial profits of wealth that is taken from the light pockets of the poor and transferred to the heavy ones of the rich, the capitalists.

Publican—Keeper of a public house.

Out-rail—Compete in putting up railing. There is a play on words here, since the word rail also means, "to abuse." Cf. the expression "to out-herod Herod."

PAGE 6.

Relative attractiveness—The attractiveness of their shops when compared with each other.

Has been lost to the nation—The labour spent on the railing is a pure waste (if the railing is useless) and the nation gains nothing by it.

Acquisitive power—The power of *acquiring* gain or profit.

The lance and the sword—Weapons of the robber barons of former times.

Blackmail—Tribute exacted by freebooters for protection and immunity.

Cozening—Cheating.

Rider and reiver—Robber *Reiver* is an obsolete word.

Quartered himself—Provided himself with lodging. Ruskin means that the medieval robber knight threatened the innkeeper and ate and drank without payment

Political economy—Economics; theory of production, exchange and distribution of wealth.

The gathering of the property etc.—Ruskin thought that the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the rich was a great peril to the state. In Ruskin's view, *Political Economy* is a moral science and therefore it was the duty of the state to

see that *all* people could live in health, happiness and prosperity, and not the rich only.

Fallacy—Misleading argument.

Granting .....true—Admitting the truth of the proposition.

No excuse for the theft—Ruskin makes this point elsewhere in his work also In *Unto This Last*. *Munera Pulveris* and *Time and Tide*, he exposes the immoral and often inhuman basis of the existing industrial order as well as the economic theory of his own day, which sought to justify that order.

PAGE 7.

Turnpike—Bar or gate across a road for toll-collecting.

Outfacing them—Getting the better of them.

Treatise on the subject of wealth,—i.e. treatise on Political Economy.

On their immediate interests,—i e. such as the question of raising their wages.

For more terrific power—i.e. Use power of *directing* labour into a certain channel. If labour is "misdirected", its effects to the state are ruinous. The capitalist *may* (and often *does*) direct labour into channels which *bring him profit*, but which *may be harmful to* the state.

Matters fearfully—Because it has fearful consequences.

Final inconvenience—Undoing. This is an example of understatement used to intensify the meaning.

PAGE 8.

In substance, not in ciphers—True wealth consists, not in bank balances, but in the things that give comfort and sustenance to man.

Practical enough statement—Statement that takes into account the realities of the situation, and is not airy theorising. The expression is a sarcastic reflection on the utilitarian doctrines of contemporary economists.

So possessed by—So much obsessed with.

Salutary—Wholesome.

From enforcing .....subjects,—From impressing on their minds the most important part of the subject in each lecture

and that part which is common to them all viz : what is the final object of all labour.

Modern school of economists—John Stuart Mill (1806-1873. David Ricardo (1772 1823) and others belonging to their school of thought.

Busy in mischief—Pun on the word "business"; mischief in the sense of "harm."

PAGE 9.

Operatives, merchants and soldiers—These correspond to the "craftsmen, salesmen and swordsmen" mentioned further down whose work is, "manufactures, selling and killing" From these are evolved the titles of the three lectures : Work Traffic and War.

Account to you.—Explain to you.

Insuperable,—Insurmountable

Eternal life—The life of the spirit ; which survives physical life; The "Kingdom of God" of the Bible.

What you say .... practical—Your talk is beautiful sentiment but not practical politics in business.

Shake off the dust..... at you—Depart indignantly from you Cf. *Matthew* X 14 : "When ye depart......shake off the dust of your feet".

I had go to say--The use of "got" is colloquial. Such colloquial expressions occur frequently in the course of these lectures. They lend a touch of raciness to the style.

PAGE 10

This intangible etc.—This vague subject, so difficult to handle viz : the question of belief in Spiritual Life.

Quantity of red clay—The human body. Cf Shakespeare "... Whilst this muddy vesture of decay."

Out of..... heap—Out of every single person who was once known to be a Christian, but is now reduced to a heap of clay.

"Doth grossly enclose it in, we cannot hear it." (*The Merchant of Venice* Act V. Sc. 164-65).

Dead-fallen air—Air contaminated by the dead bodies.

Astonished condition—Stupefied, as with a thunderbolt. Ruskin has in mind the derivation of the word "astonish"

(Ex Latin *tono*, thunder) Cf. Milton: "Lie thus astonished on the oblivious pool." (*Paradise Lost* BK I. 266).

For the present invisible—Because it is spiritual wealth; wealth or property that can be appraised only in terms of spiritual and therefore imperceptible values. Cf. *Lake* XVII. 20: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation'

More blessed to him that gave—A Biblical allusion. *Acts* XX. 35: "It is more blessed to give than to receive" The advice that one can die only once, and that death puts an end to all misery, can have a two-fold significance. To the materialist, who does not believe in eternal life, it will mean that death is the end of everything But to one who believes in eternal life, the life that survives death, it will signify the Kingdom of God, and thus will be more 'blessed" to the poor, to whom it is given; he will therefore take the advice to heart, himself rather than offer it to others.

Deliberate reader—Thoughtful reader.

Would fain—gladly.

Forward youth—Pert, saucy youth.

In any proselytizing temper—With a desire to convert others to my views

Creed—System of religious belief; person's set of opinions on any subject

I take..... find it—i e I address him as a Christian if he is a believing Christian, but if he is an unbeliever, I address him as an unbeliever.

PAGE 11.

In possession of a book—The Bible.

Straight.........God—The average Christian takes the Bible as the Word of God

In the run of all—In the general sense.

Fetish—Inanimate object worshipped by savages; principle etc. irrationally reverenced.

Talisman—Object endowed with magic power, especially of averting evil from or bringing good luck to its holder.

Captain's order—God's word of command.

Guilt of pride—According to Christian doctrine, *Pride* is one of the greatest sins. It is one of the *Seven Deadly Sins.*

Body than raiment—Cf *Matthew* VI 25 : "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment ?" *Raiment* : clothing. Ruskin insists that political economy should be based on the principle that spirit is greater than matter.

Not merely...... ...treasure—Not merely in lip-service, but in sincere belief.

Heart's treasure—Charity

"*After all .... Gentiles seek*"—Cf. *Matthew*. VI. 32. A Gentile is a heathen ; one of non-Jewish race Ruskin says that it had once been his hope to address people who set spiritual things above material ones and who did not pursue material objects like the Gentiles.

PAGE 12

Infidel—Unbeliever, non-Christian.

Dilemma—a situation offering only a choice between two or more unwelcome alternatives

Hereafter live, or hereafter die—Spiritually survive bodily death, or entirely cease to be at death

In order, for his sleep ....awakening—Be ready for the eternal sleep of death or awakening at the resurrection. Cf. Shakespeare :

"and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep." (*The Tempest*)
Act IV. Sc. I. 157-8

Father's house—in the Kingdom of God, the heavenly father Cf. *John*. XIV. 2. "In my father's house are many mansions"

The Queen—Queen Victoria.

At Court—in the sovereign's presence

Nor has the Church's etc.—The Church itself which describes death as a departure from earth to live with Christ has not cured itself of the habit of going into mourning when some Christian dies.

Desire to depart .... Christ—Biblical allusion Cf. *Philippians* I. 23. I. 23. In these words St. Paul refers to a desire to die and be united with Christ.

PAGE 13

It is a sign......of hand—It is a mean thing on the part of the Church to suggest that persons who believe in death as the

end of our life are not capable of a pure life or noble character and energetic conduct.

PAGE 13

Nor does the anticipation of death etc.—A person who believes that *death* is the final end of all life (i e that there is no other existence hereafter) is not necessarily a man who will waste the present life in a round of dissipation, unless he is really a drunkard.

But a drunkard—Biblical allusion. Cf. *Isaiah* XXII, 13: "let us eat and drink. for tomorrow we shall die."

Device in the grave—Biblical reference. *Ecclesiastes* IX 10; "there is no...device .....in the grave, whither thou goest." The Biblical verse exhorts us to make the best use of our powers while we are alive; for after death, in the grave, nothing, neither knowledge nor device (planning), is of any use.

Deviceless person—Stupid person.

Deviser—Scheming person.

Devising—Scheming, plotting. Note the play upon words in the sentence.

Nor is human ....lies down therein—Ruskin says that many orthodox Christians have a fond belief that their sins will be purged away and they will be pardoned in one moment, if only they follow the observances of the Church. This is a mistake and the right view is that a man will be dealt with according to his deeds : as you sow, so must you reap. [Ruskin is trying to show that one who disbelieves in God and Immortality is not necessarily a bad man, and *vice versa*, a bad man, who has a belief in God and the superficial rites of religion does not necessarily become a good or pure man and attain salvation after death].

What a man soweth... ..reap—Biblical ref. *Galatians* VI 7 : In these words St Paul points out how every action is followed inexorably by its appropriate fruit

Walketh no more in darkness—Biblical ref. *Psalms* XCI 6. "Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness " The Biblical verse refers to the virtuous who need not fear even the pestilence that goes about silently in the dark.

Higher hope—Hope of eternal life.

Painful creed—The materialistic belief that death is the end of everything. *Addressed to happier persons*—After these

words in a later edition Ruskin inserted a sentence containing an allusion to St. Paul on the Hill of Mars, which is not contained in the first edition.

PAGE 14.

Renewed of plumage—Ruskin has probably in mind the phoenix, a mythical bird which was believed to burn itself on a pyre and renewed from the ashes.

Numbered moments—Life that is fast drawing to a close.

Their Master—Christ.

But for you......excuse—For those who don't believe in immortality there is nothing to excuse any heartlessness.

Fruit of righteousness—Biblical ref. 2 *Corinthians*, IX 10. St. Paul exhorts the people to give alms liberally, for thereby they will "increase the fruits of your righteouness-"

Remembered no more Biblical ref: *Hebrews*, VIII 12. "their iniquities will I remember no more." St. Paul refers to God's covenant with the Israelites and the promise of pardon.

Before the moth—More easily than you can crush a moth.

In the dust...worms cover you—Bibl. ref. *Job*, XX 11 "shall lie down with him in the dust" ; and *Job* VII. 5 : "My flesh is clothed with worms"

Repay him—Avenge.

It is therefore easier etc.—Ruskin here changes his argument. He has said, "All this cruelty you can show to the poor because you believe there is no future life or punishment. But I ask you as gentlemen, Should you show such cruelty ? As from gentlemen, the answer expected is, No!"

Wantonly—Without provocation, without purpose.

PAGE 15

Curt—Brief.

Fever fit—The brevity of life is brought out in this familiar comparison. Cf. Shakespeare,

"After life's fitful fever he sleeps well."

(*Macbeth*) Act III. Sc. II. 23.

The earth only an hospital—i.e. a place of woe and suffering. A man who believes in God takes the earth as a Valley of Tears and the earthly life as a hospital, a place of suffering.

Its straw—a symbol of worthlessness. Note the antithesis between the crown of straw and the crown of wild olive a,

genuine reward of true merit. In this sentence we get the first hint of the title of the lectures.

But if this life be no dream—Here Ruskin addresses himself to those who don't believe in a future life and take the present life as the only reality.

Rest which remaineth— Bible ref. *Hebrews* IV. 9 : "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." St. Paul refers to God's promise of rest in his bosom, for the righteous after death. Ruskin again has the idea of eternal life in mind.

The heathen—The pagan Greeks.

PAGE 16.

Wild Olive—A crown of Wild Olive was the only prize awarded at the Olympic Games in ancient Greece. The olive is a small evergreen tree.

Jupiter—Chief god of the Romans, who identified him with the Greek Zeus.

Jupiter was poor—The reference is to *Plutus*, a play by the Greek comic poet Aristophanes (circa 444—circa 380 B.C.) The words occur in the speech of Poverty who, remarking on the curious fact that though the Olympic games were held in honour of Zeus, he rewarded the winners with only a crown of olive, says, "And indeed it should have been of gold, had not Jupiter been so poor."

Type of grey honour—The olive-leaf is grey: the wreath of the grey olive-leaves brings honour in old age.

Mysteries and presences—The invisible supernatural powers and presences around us

Above the height......throne—Rising like an oriental despot's tiara above the throne he has usurped.

Untormenting and divine—This is a treasure that is divine and brings no sorrow.

Life that now is—Life on earth.

Which is to come—eternal life.

PAGE 17.

LECTURE I.
WORK.

This lecture was delivered in 1865.

Working Men's Institute—The Working Men's Club and Institute Union came into existence largely owing to the efforts

of the Rev. Henry Solly, a Unitarian Minister. Started in 1862, it conducted a number of clubs for workmen in England and Wales, whose object was, generally, to draw the workers away from the public-houses and excessive use of intoxicating liquors and to provide them with opportunities for self-culture and healthy recreation.

Camberwell—Borough of London.

Working Institute—See note on Working Men's Institue, above.

District—Camberwell.

Trivialities—Trivial things (i.e. things that are trivial from the workman's point of view

I would fain tell you—See note to Page 10

Preparing the way..... life,—Making the ground ready for a great change in social and industrial life.

A great change—An immediate consequence of uncontrolled industrialization in England, during the early part of the 19th century, was the rise of appalling conditions of life among the industrial workers. But soon voices were raised in protest against this process of degradation of the working class, and gradually people's social conscience was aroused, resulting in the enactment of Factory Laws and other measures calculated to improve the life of the workers. In addition to these government measures, there was also much voluntary effort, receiving its impulse from the humanitarian movements of the time, which contribute to the betterment of the workers' life, the Working Men's Institute itself being an example of such effort. The combined effect of these activities, both govermental and voluntary, was a great improvement in the conditions of life of the industrial workers. This is the "change" to which Ruskin refers.

PAGE 18.

In any wise—In any way.

Working Men's College—The movement to educate the workmen had its origin in philanthropic effort. The rise of Chartism in the 1830's gave it a tremendous impetus, and in 1854, the working Men's College was founded in London, by Frederick Denison Maurice, a Christian Socialist leader. Its aim was to bring together workers and advanced middle class intellectuals.

Idle Men's institute ...and Colleges—Another example of Ruskin's fondness for play upon words. In "*Sesame and Lilies*" Ruskin emphasizes the importance of the study of words, with reference to their original meaning In this sentence Ruskin puts into practice his own teaching . and the expression "workiug men's," suggests to him its antithesis, "idle men's

Bitter voices—The miserable conditions of life among the industrial workers gradually resulted in bitterness and discontent And as early as 1837, there arose among them a body of political reformers known as the "Chartists," whose agitation led to riots in 1841 and 1842.

PAGE 19.

Neith r is to you that I say it—These words are addressed to the "Upper" class men present on the occasion.

Wilful... unconscious—When we act deliberately in a wrong manner, the mischief that results is limited : but the harm done unintentionally has no limits. *Bear with me*—Have patience with me. Cf : *Julius Caesar* III, 3, 107.

"Bear with me : my heart in the coffin
With Caesar."

The idle clas es—Play upon words again, and antithesis.

There is a working class... among both rich and poor—Ruskin maintains that it is misleading to use the term "working class" as if it were a synonym for the expression, "the poor." He points out that the habit of honest work is not an exclusive monopoly either of the rich or of the poor. Honest workers are to be found among both sections of the community, the rich and the poor; so are idlers.

PAGE 20.

The distinction be ween etc.—The two opposite classes of idlers and workers are found among all ranks in society—the richest and the poorest.

The wise of one class.........the foolish of the other—The hard-working among one section always speak with reference the idlers of the other. This leads to a great deal of unnecessay misunderstanding and embitters the relations between the rich and the poor. Noteonce again the antithesis, "wise—foolish"

We'll talk of that—Note the colloquial "we'll" for "we will."

The fact that these essays were written for oral delivery, accounts for the rather liberal use of such colloquial expressions which Ruskin permits himself.

PAGE 21.

Industrious—Hard working, diligent.

Infinite........ power—Distinctions showing rising points and falling levels in society and a vast range of suffering and power.

Work with the head – Do mental work i.e. work involving primarily the use of the brain.

With the hand—Do manual labour i.e. work involving primarily physical exertion.

PAGE 22.

You play, as you call it— The parenthesis suggests that Ruskin himself was not particularly enthusiastic about games.

So, in like manner etc— The definition here given is that "any exertion of mind or body" done merely to *please* ourselves —and no other purpose—is *play*. The definition puts its stress on *purpose*. All amateur work will be *play*, according to this definition.

The first of all English games is making money—Ruskin sarcastically refers to the dominantly commercial instincts of the English. Napoleon, it may be recalled, called the English a nation af shopkeepers.

He doesn't make it to do anything with it—This assumption of Ruskin is open to criticism. The assumption is that man makes money only for money's sake.

PAGE 23

It is a great city of play ......but still play— Note the biting sarcasm. London has the reputation of being the commercial centre of the world. Ruskin implies that the Englishman pursues money with the same passion and singleness of purpose with which an amateur cultivates his favourite game.

Lord's cricket ground—It is in London It belongs to the Marylebone Cricket Club and is regarded as the headquarters of the game. It is called after Thomas Lord, who founded it in 1814.

With pockets .. ...bottomless pit—A billiard table is provided with six pockets around it, into which the balls are driven. Ruskin compares the making of money to the game of billiards; but it is a game in which, instead of balls, one drives money into the pockets ; and the pockets themselves are deep as the "bottomless pit"of Hell, because there is no end to the greed of the commercial magnates. The bitterness of Ruskin's tone should be noted.

Playing at counters—A counter is the table that rests between the banker or shopkeeper and his customers. Ruskin sarcastically suggests that making money is a kind of game played with counters.

"Winning "money and "making "it—Ruskin has in mind the speculators on the Stock Exchange, the hub of the commercial world. He maintains that the transactions on the Exchange do not always involve the actual production of goods or commodities, but are often in the nature of gambling vetures, whereby mony is transferrd to the pockets of the lucky speculators from those of the unlucky ones, without adding to the real wealth of the community One merely" wins" money by speculation ; one " makes " it when one produces goods or useful things

Game laws—From the time of the Norman conquest England has had severe laws for the preservation of game—i. e. deer etc. kept in enclosed parks for the King and great nobles to hunt. The common peasants entering these parks without permission or stealing game were mercilessly punished.

That beautiful.........special English game—Note the sarcasm.

PAGE 24.

Beautiful arrangement— Again sarcastic.

Grouse and black-cook—Game birds.

Brace—a pair.

To the garret—Living in a garret. A garret is a room on the top floor. It is a symbol of poverty because it is the cheapest part of a house, from the point of view of rent. Cf. Dr. Johnson's essay on" *The Advantages of Living in a Garret*." In this sentance Ruskin refers to the habits of the aristocracy, who main-

tain game-preserves (i. e. places wherein they have a monopoly of the right to hunt or shoot). Ruskin implies that these wealthy people are wickedly indifferent to the welfare of the poor people working under them. In their eyes, their tenants are no better than the game birds which they shoot, and they treat both of them alike.

Many mansions .....but He none—Biblical reference. *John* XIV. 2 : "In my Father's House are many mansions." Also *Revelation*, XXI 15 and 16 : "And he that talked with me had a golden reed to measure the city "; "The city lieth four-square " In this sentence Ruskin refers to the injustice and inhumanity underlying the present social order, which tolerates the existence of the luxury (Cf game preserves) of the rich, side by side with the grinding poverty of the poor (Cf. garrets). Ruskin wonders what the angels who built the house of God or the four square city of New Jerusalem would think of the ignoble social structure that the English people have reared on earth. The English, by countenancing such poverty, seem in a perverted fashion, to give reality and concrete form to the words of Christ who declared that the poor are " blessed", and who, being Himself a symbol of poverty, had not even a hole wherein to lay His head

Four square city—The city of New Jerusalem, described by S. John in the *Revelation*. Cf "The Kingdom of God".

What they think—i. e. what the angel-builders of the city of New Jerusalem think of the plotting and division of the land in England.

PAGE 25.

The fashion......frankly through them—Ruskin sarcastically observes that the rich have set a new fashion of dress for the poor peasantry,—the fashion of going about in ragged and torn clothing. He holds the rich responsible for the poverty of the peasants,—a poverty that does not permit them to wear even a decent dress.

Doublets—Kind of garment.

Irregularly slashed—To "slash" a sleeve, is so to cut it with slits as to show the different kinds of cloth that go to its mak ing Ruskin's phrase however refers ironically to the fact that the peasants' dress is torn.

Scarlet and gold—Scarlet or red used to be the colour of the British army uniform The "gold" refers to the gold braid used to decorate the uniform, *Khaki* has taken the place of *scarlet* nowadays.

In grey—It is interesting to note that "fieldgrey" is the colour of the modern German army uniform. as "Khaki" is that of the British.

Without feathers—Without decoration or ornament. Ruskin probably refers to the plume in the officer's hat, in the uniform of his day.

Bats and balls—The armament, the guns and ammunition used in war.

About fifteen millions of money annually—This was so in Ruskin's time. But since then the army expenditure has vastly increased. In the present war, England spends about fifteen millions not annually, but daily Again England and France are now on longer each other's rivals. England's rival to-day is Germany and latterly Japan.

PAGE 26.

Philologists—Those who study the structure and development of language

Dialect—A variety of language differing from the standard in vocabulary, pronunciation or idiom

Sense of the word "play"—Viz. that *play* now means *illness* in the black country of Birmingham etc

Black country of Birmingham—Ruskin has in mind the murky and smoke-laden appearance of Birmingham, one of the chief industrial centres of England.

Red and black—Ruskin refers to the practice of gambling that is prevalent at the fashionable pleasure resorts. "*Rouge-et-Noir*" (French for red and black) is the name of a gamblers' card game.

Baden Baden—A fashionable watering place of Germany. It used to be one of Europe's greatest gaming centres. In this sentence, Ruskin points out how the industrial workers have hardly anytime for play or pastime. They cease from work only when they are ill : hence, with them, the word "play" is a synonym for the word "illness". On the other hand, to the

rich people thronging to places like Baden Baden, the word play means gambling.

"One moment ....for feeble man"—Quotation from "*Night Thoughts*", a poem by Edward Young.

"We have piped unto you..."— Biblical reference. Cf. *Matthew XI*. 16, 17. Piping and dancing are the outward manifestations of happiness The sad children of the industrial workers can neither dance nor pipe, because they have never known happiness. They can only mourn; but the mourning goes unheeded by the rich and the prosperous.

This then the distinction... ... . "upper and lower classes."—The terms "upper" and "lower" are often co-extensive with the terms "idle rich" and "over worked poor." In this sense the distinction implies an unjust ordering of society, which could be, and should be, done away with.

For gnats and sucking fish—i.e. creatures not endowed with the higher faculties of the mind, which distinguish man form the lower organisms.

Neither days nor lives etc.—Work is the most holy and purifying thing—not the observance of the Sabbath and Feast Days !

PAGE 27

Grace—Thanks-giving before or after meals.

Vineyard—Biblical reference : *Matthew. XXI. 28.* The quotation is from one of Christ's parables, wherein a father asks his scn to go and work in the vine-yard. Ruskin implies that there can be no greater sin for a true Christian than idleness ; and when we cast out this sin, the terms "upper" and "lower" will cease to mean "idle" and "over-worked" as they often do at present.

Dives and Lazarus—Biblical reference : *Luke XVI 19, 20.* Christ narrates a parable about a rich man called Dives and an ailing beggar named Lazarus. The names have become synonyms for "The rich" and "The poor" respectively. "Dives" is a *Latin* word meaning, a "rich man."

Than ever.... Christian—Than ever existed in the world in the pagan (Greek or Roman) world before Christ or in Christian society after Christ.

Count Teufelskine—Ruskin's grim sense of humour is seen in this name which he has coined "Teufel" is German for "devil." Cf. Teufelsdrockh of Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*.

Such a man is now here etc.—The whole of this paragrahp in omitted in the later edition of *The Crown of Wild Olive*.

Chiaroscuro—Artistic use of light and shade to secure contrast. Note the sarcastic tone of the sentence.

PAGE 28

Chez Bignon—At Bignon's we should say in English, Bignon being the name of a Paris restaurant. Ruskin uses the French expression "chez" to suggest the air of sophisticated elegance that characterized Count Teufelskine

Alms-house—A house founded by charity to tend the poor.

Shadwell—District of East London

Bone-picker—One who goes about collecting odds and ends for re-sale. The bones thus collected are finally turned into fertilizers or used up in the sugar refineries.

PAGE 29.

Dietary sale—The amount of food to be given to the paupers.

Sufficient to support nature—Enough to sustain life.

Poor Law Act—The Poor Laws of Great Britain provide for looking after the indigent. The date from the Elizabethan times. In 1834 an important Act was passed to reform abuses in the administration of these laws.

Andover Union—Andover is a borough and market town of Hampshire, England

Employed to crush—In the work-houses, set up to look after the indigent, the inmates, unless they are too old or infirm, are made to do work, like breaking stones or crushing bones Read Dickens's, *Oliver Twist* for the picture of a typical work-house in early 19th century.

Our Lazarus—The expression is used in a general sense, meaning the poor among those who profess the Christian faith.

Some advantage—Note the irony

Jewish Lazarus.........rich man's table—The character in Christ's parable. Cf. *Luke XVI*. 20. Lazarus, the beggar, came for the crumbs that fell from rich man's table.

Dog's table—Because they eat the bones left over by the dogs as is evident from the newspaper paragraph quoted by Ruskin.

Within its proper limits..... frame-work of society—Ruskin does not believe in economic equality. He accepts economic *inequality* as the basis of the social structure He denounces only the gross abuses to which that inequality often gives rise. Ruskin has no use for socialism

Corrupting......Society—Causing the basis of society to rot and crumble down.

PAGE 30.

Rapine— Plundering.

Systems of rapine—A system where men live by plundering each other.

The power held.. ...exact it—i e. the tyranny of the capitalist in determining the avenues of work.

PAGE 31.

Pew-rents—A pew is the space in a church partitioned off, usually between the backs of two benches, seating a number of the congregation at church services Pew-rent is the rent paid for such accommodation.

Baptismal fees—Fees paid to the priest for baptizing, i.e. performing the religious ceremony of immersing in or sprinkling with water as a sign of purification and admission into the Christian religion.

More or less—This phrase may be said to be a mannerism of Ruskin's.

Life and death—Spiritual life and spiritual death.

Two masters—Biblical allusion. Cf. *Matthew. VI* 24. Christ warns his disciples that they must make their choice between God and Mammon because they cannot serve two masters. Mammon is an Armaic word for "riches", but it is used as a proper name of the devil of covetousness. (Cf. *Paradise Lost* Book I.679: "Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell from Heaven.") Ruskin maintains that each one of us has to make a choice whether we shall allow ourselves to be guided in our actions by the divine sense of duty or by mere

avarice ; the former leads to spiritual health, as the latter spells spiritual death.

Who is the Devil—Mammon.

"*Least erected .. fell*"—Cf. *Paradise Lost* Bk. I. 6 9 Ruskin, quoting from memory, substitutes the word "friend" for the original "spirit."

PAGE 32.

And it makes a difference......is perfect slavery—To do one's duty and thus serve God is to attain spiritual freedom; to become a prey to greed is to be a bond-slave to Mammon and forfeit spiritual freedom.

King of King's—God. Biblical reference. Cf. *Revelation XIX* 16."On his vesture and on his thigh a name is written, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords,"—in these words the Biblical passage describes God.

Vesture—Dress.

Whose service......freedom—In serving God man attains his highest freedom.

Slave of Slaves—Devil. Ruskin coins a description parallel to the Biblical phrase of "King of Kings."

Fiend—Devil.

Fiend's servants -Those who serve, not God, but Satan.

Judas bargain—Biblical reference. Cf. *Matthew XXVI.* 14—16. Judas, one of the twelve disciples of Christ, betrayed his master to his enemies for "thirty pieces of silver". Ruskin maintains that those who prefer Mammon to God, and allow themselves to be led astray by greed, betray God, and are no better than Judas But such betrayal, Ruskin points out, arises from stupidity and the ignorance of the people as to wherein lies their spiritual well-being, which is the only true well-being.

Iscariot—Judas; also known as Judas Iscariot.

Worth of Him—Christ's greatness.

Have the grace—Have the sense of propriety.

Muddle headed—Confused in his thoughts.

Pilfering—Thieving

Shift for himself—Manage to save himself.

PAGE 33.

Bye-perquisites—Side profits or additional income.

Thirty pieces—The sum of money for which Judas betrayed Christ. See note above on "Judas bargain."

Come what will—Whatever might happen.

Bagmen—Ruskin invents this word to describe those who are dominated by mercenary motives.

"Fee first" men—Fellows who put money before all other things.

What is called the power of capital—It is a savage criticism of the capitalist to compare him with Judas Iscariot.

Except the labour's food—Here Ruskin has in mind Ricardo's *Wage-Fund Theory*. Ricardo held that the result of competition and the operation of the laws of demand and supply would be that the workman would get just enough for his livelihood from what remained after the landlord got his rent and the capitalist his profits. Ruskin and others denounced the theory as "the Iron Law of Wages". The trend of modern economic doctrine is just the opposite. viz: that the capitalist would get his *profits* last of all after the labourer has got his wages and out of these profits often the state would claim a share. Compare the modern doctrine of Excess Profits Tax.

Modern Judas—The "bagmen"; especially the capitalists whose main principle in life is summed up in the word, "profit."

Carrying the bag—Making his profits. Biblical reference. Cf. *John*. XII. 6. Describing Judas, the Biblical verse tells us that he "had the bag, and bare what was put therein." Ruskin coins the phrase on the basis of the Biblical description of Judas, the man who betrayed Christ for "thirty pieces of silver", which, doubtless, he carried in that same bag.

Mon y is in this respect etc.—This is really a fantastic comparison that Ruskin makes here of the capitalist with the marauding baron of the Middle Ages But Ruskin is in earnest about it. He has referred to it in his Preface. See the reference to the "Old rider and reiver" at 1. 36 of page 5 above.

Cunningest—Unusual form of the superlative ; we should say, ordinarily, "the most cunning."

What mountain promontories etc.—In the Middle Ages the unruly barons seized possession of mountain promontories and built their forts there, from which they swooped down on the

valleys below and forcibly levied toll from all way-farers passing within range of their forts.

PAGE 34.

Build another tower of his mon y castle – Ruskin compares the modern captitalist who exploits the industrial workers in particular, and the community in general, to the medieval barons. The barons fought to get possession of strategic places li e mountain promontories, whereon they built fortified castles to defend themselves. The modern millionaires fight for economic privileges, and every million that they make, serves further to strengthen those privileges Figuratively, these millionaires may be said to live securely in "money castles" whose walls are made of those special privileges, which their possession of economic power confers upon them.

Vagrants—The who go from place to place.

Bag-baron—Ruskin's name for the modern capitalist.

Crag-baron—The medieval baron or lord who built his castles on crags, i.e. rocks or promontories.

Bags, crags... rags—Another example of Ruskin's play upon words Note the rhyme Rags are a symbol of poverty. Ruskin points out that though the medieval baron and the modern capitalist differ as to their methods and weapons, the effect of their activities on the life of the poor is the same, viz. oppression and victimization.

Both got ill and spent ill—When money is the chief object in life, there will creep in immoral ways of earning and spending it.

Die rich—Leave enormous wealth on death.

PAGE 35.

Unjust war protracted—wars are commonly financed by raising loans. It should be noticed that Ruskin is not a pacifist. He condemns only unjust war. (Cf. third lecture).

Squibs and crackers—kind of fireworks.

Think twice before—Hesitate.

Russian children and Austrian children—The governments of Russia and Austria, who raised loans on the London money market Ruskin compares them to children asking for money to buy toys.

Cartridges and bayonets—The loans raised by these governments were spent on armaments.

To attack you in India—From time to time the British have entertained fears about Russian desings on india. Ruskin's phrase gives expression to this fear

Keep down ..... in Italy - For quite a long time Italy was only a geographical expression It was divided into a number of more or less independent states. and was dominated by Austria. It was in 1861 that Italy began to emerge as a united nation, when Victor Emmanuel, King of Sardinia, was declared King of Italy. It was not however until 1870 that the liberation and unification of Italy was achieved

To murder Polish women and childern—From 1814 onwards, until the first world war, Poland had ceased to be an independent nation, its territory having been divided between Russia, Prussia and Austria Ruskin's phrase refers to the oppression of the Poles at the hands of their foreign masters.

They pay you interest for it—Ruskin maintains that so long as they get a good return for their money by way of interest, the British people do not care for what inhuman or tyrannical purpose the money that they lend is being used.

That is a broad fact—That is the glaring truth about it, viz. the Egnlish capitalist's profits come from the oppression of the peasants of Austria and Russia.

Bishop Colens —John William Colenso (1814-1883) was an English clergyman. He was for some time Bishop of Natal, in South Africa His views on the *Old Testament* of the Bible aroused keen controversy and were considered heretical. In his work called, "*Critical Examination of the Pentateuch*," he maintained that the books of Moses really belonged to the Postexile period of the Jews.

And then you..... order—It is a strange thing, (says Ruskin), that the very people who denounce Bishop Colenso as a heretic for his unorthodox views on the Pentateuch should be the capitalists who batten on the oppression and massacre of Poles and Italians The "heresy" of Colenso is far better than the "orthodox faith" of these capitalists !

Forsooth—To be sure : no doubt. The expression is used ironically.

And you believed in it—Ruskin observes that indignation of the British people at Bishop Colenso's writings would lead one to think that they were in earnest about the teachings of the Bible. But. to think so. would be to commit a capital mistake ; for the British public are intent only on earning profits. and care nothing at all for the spiritual values emphasized in the Bible

PAGE 36

Third condition of separation—The third distinction.

Gentlemen—Men of refinement. Note the play on words and the antithesis between "rough work, rough men" and "gentle work. gentlemen"

Honourableness—Quality worthy of being honourd.

Manual labour—Work performed with the hands ; labour involving primarily physical exertion.

Dignity of humanity—The worth of one's personality. It is often maintained that one should not quarrel with the nature of the work that falls to one's lot Any kind of work. however humble or mean it may be, it is said. is capable of enhancing the dignity of the personality of the doer, provided it is done conscientiously Ruskin exposes the hypocrisy underlying such advice:—advice often tendered to the poor manual workers by the more fortunate members of society.

Sancho Panza - Name of the comic squire of the even more comic knight. Don Quixote. the hero of a burlesque novel of that name. by the Spanish author Cervantes.

Fine words butter no parsnips— A proverb. Fine words may please the ear, but they do not alter the ugly realities of life.

Dairy—Ruskin refers to the English Parliament. He implies that the Parliament, instead of doing things to improve the life of the workers, only gives them fine words and orations. Ruskin. it may be noted, like his great contemporary, Carlyle, had a contempt for Parliament and its way of doing things. or rather, of *not* getting them done.

Holding a collier's helm ... on a lee shore—A collier is a coal-ship. Lee shore is to leeward of a ship i.e. towards the side away from the wind.

PAGE 37.

Reading books, classing butterflies, painting pictures—Examples of work that does not involve hard physical exertion. It is the entomologist who studies and classifies butterflies, beetles, moths etc.

While the fine..... dishonourable—A good deal of brain-work in art and literature does not conduce to a moral life, but has a sensual quality about it. Such work is therefore *not* honourable.

Ignoble—Note the antithesis.

"*In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread*"—Biblical reference. Cf. *Genesis*. III. 19. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread". In these words God pronounced his sentence on Adam, for his sin of disobedience, condemning him to unremitting toil. Note how Ruskin alters the original order of words. As quoted by Ruskin, the rhythm emphasizes the word "thou," as if the injunction to toil were addressed especially to the poor manual worker, as the rich often seem to imply by their conduct

Calamity—Misfortune ; because the necessity for toil was a part of God's sentence on Adam, the first man.

Cursed for our sake—The ground was cursed by God in order to punish man. *Genesis*. III, 17.

Contest with its thorn and its thistle—There is no reason why this *contest with thorn and thistle* should be a degradation—and really Ruskin is unfair to the poor peasant. But Ruskin is *misled* into this view because the Bible has described the agricultural labour as a *curse* upon Adam for his disobedience to God's command !

Holiday—Is from, "holy day"

Die in the Lord—Die faithful to the teachings of Christ.

"*They rest...... follow them*"—Biblical reference Cf. *Revelation* XIV. 13. In the Biblical verse, God promises rest from toil, to the faithful. Instead of "they rest," the original reads "they may rest".

PAGE 38.

All good men..... them—Ruskin is thinking of the social welfare work or plans of men like Charles Kingsley, Carlyle,

Tolstoy etc--while Bright, Cobden, and Mill offered solutions based on Free Trade and Franchise.

Doing about them—Being done about them.

Decisive—Final; conclusive.

Cannot help ourselves–Cannot refrain from doing it.

Ordered, soldierly, human way—Note the antithesis and balance with. "disorderly, scrambling, doggish way."Ruskin uses "doggish" in the sense of "unintelligent."

Dressed—The reference is to the soldier's uniform.

Labour that feeds—Agricultural work.

Plough-exercise—For the labour that feeds.

Teach .....exercise—Agricultural work must be taught in the same systematic manner as army training.

Sword exercise—For the labour that kills : war.

Troops of life—Trained agricultural workers.

Troops of death—Military troops.

PAGE 39.

Squabbling—Quarrelling. *People.........just to do*—There are endless controversies as to the utility, wisdom, expediency etc. of an action : but nobody bothers to think about the *justness*—or *unjustness of it* !

Adviseablest—We should spell "advisablest;" we should also say "the most advisable."

Profitablest—Another unusual form of the superlative.

Master—Christ.

Reiterated—Repeated again and again.

"*Do justice and judgment*"—Biblical reference. Cf. *Genesis* XVIII. 19: "They shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment"

Psalms—Sacred songs in the *Old Testament*, in the Bible. Cf. *Psalms*. XCI "Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, allye lands."

Need anything—Biblical reference. Cf. *Matthew*. VI. 8 : Christ says : "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him."

Evil Spirit—The Devil.

Service—Ruskin sarcastically refers to the fact that worship in the Church, which consists usually of praying and psalmsinging, is commonly described as "divine service."

It is nothing—Ruskin implies that most praying and psalm-singing is reduced to an idle chanting of words whose significance is seldom taken to heart.

PAGE 40.

Chauntings—Archaic spelling of "chantings."

Divine Service– See note on service, above.

That's our word—Note the colloquial from of, "that is."

Charity—Alms-giving.

As much... ...no justice—We are liberal enough to give alms, but we refuse to do justice !

Your brother—Fellowman.

It is all very fi e......l ve of yourself— When we give alms, we like to think that we have made a good start in the way of righteousness. But it is a delusion, for such alms-giving begins and ends in self-love and self-satisfaction ; it only produces a feeling of self-complacency. (Cf the saying: "Charity begins at home.")

Have got to—Colloquial expression.

Sunday boots, Sunday feathers - Part of the special dress reserved for Sunday wear while attending the weekly "service" at Church. Cf. the expression "Sunday best."

PAGE 41.

Crossing sweeper—One employed to sweep the foot-paths and street crossings.

Got up—Dressed.

It - Ruskin wants to convey that the crossing sweeper has been degraded to a condition, wherein it is difficult even to recognize him as a human being.

Going abroad Applied to others. Note the contrast with the phrase "at home" in the popular saying, indicated earlier in the notes.

Christian Justice—Personification of justice as practised by Christians

Seemingly blind– In pictures justice is usually represented as a blindfolded figure, with a pair of scales in her hand

With her bandage off—The goddess of justice cannot be deceived. She is able to discern the innermost motives of our actions and judge them accordingly (for Bandage : Cf. previous note.)

Every other Sunday—On alternate Sundays.

That's the gist etc.—Here is the main point of the discussion.

PAGE 42.

Modern Christianity—The way the teachings of Christ are put into practice nowadays. This is of course very sarcastic.

Half way Mahometan—According to Ruskin, the Mohamedan religion does not reveal the Truth as completely as Christianity does But even so, it rightly emphasizes justice in its teachings.

Supposing, then, .. they are to have—The first question to decide (with as much justice as possible) is who is to do the manual labour; the second question is to decide on the reward or wages

Being cheated—Mountebanks and charlatans wheedle money out of us; but we are reluctant to pay for honest work.

Your talker—Member of Parliament Note the touch of contempt. Carlyle, also, preached the gospel of silence.

Iliad—Epic poem, ascribed to the great Greek poet, Homer. It deals with the events that occurred during the tenth and last year of the siege of Troy or Ilium, by the Greeks

Only bitter bread and salt—The tradition is that he had to go begging for bread. It is said that seven cities claimed the honour to have given birth to Homer *when dead*, through which he had gone begging for bread *when alive*.

Paradise—"Paradiso" is the third part (the first two being "Inferno" and "Purgatorio,") of the epic poem, "Divina Commedia," of Alighieri Dante (1265-1321) the great Italian poet

PAGE 43.

Telescope—The invention of the telescope is ascribed to the Italian scientist Galileo Galilei (1564-1642.)

With a dungeon—Galileo was imprisoned by the authorities of the Church for maintaining that the planets move round the sun.

Miscroscope—It is not certain who invented the microscope, and it is difficult to identify the person Ruskin has in mind.

Baruch the scribe—Hebrew writer mentioned in the book

of Jeremiah (one of the books of The Old Testament, in the Bible) as the prophet's secretary.

St. Stephen .....stones—Biblical reference. Cf. *Acts VII.* 58 St Stephen, as he preached, accused the people of the murder of Christ ; and they "cast him out of the city, and stoned him."

Penny a line—In the 18th century this was the rate of payment by publishers to unknown authors—described generally as a niggardly payment: but Baruch did not get even that.

Pharisees—An ancient Jewish sect noted for strict observance of law and ceremonial.

World father's proper payment—What the world pays. The world in which we are born is compared to a father.

Not bread, a stone—Biblical reference. *Luke*. XI. 11. Christ describing God, the heavenly father, as being more gracious than the earthly parents, "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone"?

Keep you quiet—i.e. in the grave. Note the grim pun on the word "stone" Cf. "tombstone."

Break stones—It should be remembered that the inmates of the work—houses were set to break stones or crush bones.

Note to be broken by them—If the spirit of the workers is strong enough, it can survive the most degrading and the hardest kind of work.

Some day—After death. Ruskin refers to the spiritual reward of the righteous. Cf The Kingdom of God.

More pence-Cf. Peter's pence : money paid as tax or voluntary contribution to the Pope's treasury.

Peter the Fisherman—One of the twelve disciples of Christ. He was originally a fisherman of Galilee, a province of Palestine. Ruskin uses the expression to mean a true and humble follower of Christ.

Peter the Pope—Peter, the humble and devout fisherman, later became the founder of the Church of Christ It is from Peter that the Pope at Rome claims spiritual succession. Cf. *Matthew*. XVI. 18 : Christ addressing Peter says. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church" Peter, the first Pope, therefore was a dignitary of the Church, and as such was the antithesis of Peter, the humble fisherman that he used to be. Ruskin says that in bestowing spiritual rewards (Cf.

pence) the humble will be given preference over the rich or the powerful.

Holding their tongues out of it – Ruskin also, like Carlyle, preaches the gospel of silent action.

Soldierly – Disciplined.

Captains and lieutenants of labour—Worthy, expert leaders of labour.

PAGE 44.

Theatrical gardens......tinflowers, gas sunshine—Artificial gardens on the stage, set up with the help of stage properties.

Girls dancing because of their misery—Dancing is an expression of joy. But these girls, engaged to dance of public places of entertainment, like the theatres, dance, not because they feel happy, but because their poverty and starvation compel them, in order to earn their livelihood.

Playing in the midst thereof—Echo of the Bible. Cf. *Zechariah* VIII. 5, wherein God promises to restore the city of Jerusalem, so that "the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof."

My working friends—In the later editions, Ruskin substituted, "My laborious friends."

PAGE 45

Iniquity or inequity—Both words are from the Latin "aequus", the later spelling however suggests the meaning more obviously. Cf. Equity = fairness.

All your "Lord, Lord's"—In spite of your empty professions of devotion to God Cf. *Matthew* VII. 21, where Christ warns the people : "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Depart from me, ye that work iniquity—Biblical reference. Cf *Matthew* VII. 23. God will not be deceived. He will turn away from those who have not lived according to His teaching. In the Biblical verse, Christ says, "Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me ye that work iniquity."

Fair-work—Ruskin invents this expression on the analogy of "fair-play," in order to convey the idea of justice with reference to the conditions under which people are made to work.

Foul-work—Again on the analogy of "foul-play" conveying the idea of work performed under degrading conditions.

Prize fighter—Professional pugilist; one who boxes for money or other reward.

Prize-merchant—On the analogy of "prize-fighter."

Loads dice—Secretly weights the dice in order to make them turn according to his wish, thus securing unfair advantage over his opponent Dice are small cubes used in games of chance.

Loads scales—The trader deceives his rivals and customers by using false weights, or untrue scales

PAGE 46

Dishonest fabric—Cloth with flaws in it.

The fault in a fabric the worse of the two—Ruskin holds bad workmanship to be a greater crime than giving false measure.

Your suffrages,—One of the cries of the Chartist Movement about 1840 was for "universal suffrage"

Your reforms—Parliamentary Acts affecting the method of sending members to the House of Commons, were passed in 1832, 1867 and 1884 in the 19th century. Ruskin has the Reform Act of 1832 in his mind.

Free trade measures—Free trade implies unrestricted trade (*i e*. trade free from duties or taxes) between nations. The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, was a free trade measure, as it abolished the duty on imported corn.

Wrong hand—Note the pun; the cards dealt to a player are called a "hand". Ruskin has still in mind his earlier use of phrases like "foul-play" and "foul-work". The "wrong hand" too, conveys the same idea.

All our bees' business turns to spiders—Good, wholesome work is turned into wicked work The bee produces useful things, honey and wax,—"sweetness and light"; the spider produces only poison and filth to kill the poor flies with. Cf. The dialogue between the bee and the spider in Jonathan Swift's "*Battle of the Books*."

The greatest waste that you can commit is the waste of labour—A memorable sentence this—worthy to be chewed and digested—and a proper theme for an essay.

PAGE 47.

But if, instead of wooden bowls .....that is no waste—Mark the tone of prophetic denunciation.

That is no waste—Very sarcastic

Kill them with second deaths .. hundredfold deaths—A striking way of saying that one could not encompass the spiritual death of the workers more completely than by setting them to make useless things See *Revelation*,—XX 11—15.

To stop a man's breath—To put an end to his physical life.

Love-messengers—Ruskin's ironic description of bullets.

Made the walls of that grave everlasting—Ruskin maintains that we try, as far as we may, to crush the very spirit of the workers, to kill them spiritually, so that at the Resurrection, their spirits shall not rise from the graves, to stand before God.

PAGE 48.

I fancy the goodly bricks... ..the sod over labourer's head—As a matter of fact, says Ruskin, it is the rich who will have difficulty in rising from their graves at the Resurrection ; because, it is they, rather than the poor, who are spiritually dead. Cf. *Mark X 25* : Speaking about riches, Christ says, " It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God."

Family vault—Wealthy families sometimes have family vaults i.e. cellars or tombs reserved for burying members of the family

Hold closer—Thus preventing the spirit from rising.

Resurrection—The coming to life of the dead on the Judgment Day. Belief in the Resurrection is a part of the Christian faith.

"*Thy Kingdom come*"—Words from the Lord's prayer as given by Christ Cf *Matthew VI*. 10 : "Thy Kingdom come. They will be done on earth, as it is in heaven."

Takes God's name in vain—This Biblical reference is to the third of the Ten Commandments, forbidding swearing, given by Moses to his people : "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." (*Exodus XX.7.*)

Your King—Christ.

Striking...... with the reed—Biblical reference. The Biblical verse describes how Christ was ill-treated by his enemies when he was arrested. Cf. *Matthew XXVII. 30*: "And

they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head."

"The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation" ....

"The Kingdom of God is within you"—In these words Christ answered the Pharisees when they asked him about the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God is not a material thing: it is of the spirit ; it is invisible and is to be found in one's own heart.

The Kingdom of God is within you—See *Luke XII. 21.*

The Kingdom of God is not meat......Holy Ghost—Biblical allusion. In these words St Paul describes the Kingdom of God. Cf. *Romans XIV.* 17.

PAGE 49.

Holy Ghost—God.

"Whosoever will not receive......therein" and "Suffer...... is the Kingdom of heaven."—Biblical reference Cf. *Mark X.* 14 and 15. In these words Christ spoke of children. Only those can attain the Kingdom of God, who in their hearts, are able to recapture the innocence of childhood

Suffer little children etc.—See *Matthew XIX.* 14. Christ liked children for their purity and innocence.

There will be children..... hoary head is the crown—Childhood, with its innocence, has its place in the Kingdom of God; but ripe old age, when it is the culmination of a life well spent, is the highest thing to which a man can aspire. The portion from "There will be children there, but the hoary head etc" to "have we learned our child's lesson" at line 23 was omitted by Ruskin in his later edition; however, the sentence, "Length of days......and peace" is included in the later editions

"Length of days ......and peace"—Biblical reference: King Solomon in one of his proverbs says that those who keep his law will enjoy the blessings of "length of days......and peace." Cf *Proverbs III. 2.*

The little child of David—Biblical reference. II *Samuel, XII.* 15. 16. 18 David, king of Israel, caused Uriah the Hittite to be killed, and married his wife, with whom he had committed adultery. God punished David by taking away the child that Uriah's wife bare him : "The Lord struck the child that Uriah's wife bare unto David, and it was very sick. David

therefore besought God for the child...And it came to pass on the seventh day, that the child died"

Little child of Jeroboam......on its own threshold—Biblical allusion : I. *Kings XIV*. 12, 17. Jeroboam, King of Israel, offended God by setting up golden calves to worship ; and his child fell ill because of its father's sin. When Jeroboam's wife went to consult the prophet Ahijah about her child's illness, God told her, through the prophet, "Arise, therefore, get thee to thine own house : and when thy feet enter into the city, the child shall die.' And God's curse came to pass, for, "Jeroboam's wife rose, and departed and came to Tirzah : and when she came to the threshold of the door, the child died.

Its own threshold—At the threshold, or beginning of its own life.

Weary old David—David's reign was passed in incessant warfare, mainly against his rebellious son Absalom.

Weary old Barzillai—Biblical reference. Cf. II. *Samuel. XIX*. 32 Barzillai was an old man who once entertained King David. "Now Barzillai was a very aged man, even fourscore years old : and he had provided the king of sustenance."

PAGE 50.

Plato—The great Greek philosopher (428—347 B. C.) Ruskin has in mind Plato's "Republic", a dialogue on political philosophy.

PAGE 51.

Abraham—Founder of the Jewish nation.

"*Oh stranger......their words*"—These are the words of the epitaph on the gallant Spartans who died defending the pass of Thermopylae against the Persian invaders of Greece in 480 B C. This action of the Spartans has become a type and symbol for all time, of courage in the face of overwhelming odds.

Careful for nothing—An echo of St. Paul's exhortation : "Be careful for nothing;" *Philippians. IV 6.*

Thought for the morrow—The reference is to Christ's injunction, inculcating trust in God. "Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for, "your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." *Matthew VI*. 32,34.

PAGE 52.

For lovely human......sun—Pure play and joy is like sunshine, beautifying all it falls upon. It *brightens* up work and toil.

There's a worker for you—This is a good picture of what a good workman should be.

Rejoiceth as a strong man.........his course—An echo of *Psalms XIX* 5. The Biblical verse describes how the sun, along with the other created things, bears witness to the glory of God, and, "rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race."

With a ray here and a flash there......of jewels everywhere—Note how these words could be split up into two verses with poetic rhythm, and complete with rhyme.

"*Except .....as little children*"—Jesus, placing a child in the midst of his disciples, told them in these words, that unless they became innocent like little children, they would not be able to enter the Kingdom of God Cf. *Matthew. XVIII*. 3.

Long faces—Serious or gloomy faces (Cf the phrase, "to pull a long face".) Ruskin does not agree with the Puritan view of life.

Delightsomeness—The word is more poetic than "delightfulness."

Conventicle—A secret meeting or meeting-house for religious worship, especially of dissenters, when religious dissent was illegal.

Backsliding—Falling back into sinful ways of life. Ruskin condemns those people who seem to think that piety consists in making themselves gloomy and wretched, and who are continually obsessed by the fear of sin. In the case of Trades Union strikes, workers who having struck work again went back to work without the permission of the Trades Union concerned, were called "back-sliders."

Long clothes—Swaddling clothes in which children are usually wrapped up.

Medicine for your healing—Echo of *Revelation XXII. 2.* St. John describes the tree of life, whose leaves are "for the healing of the nations."

PAGE 53.

"*The poison of asps......lips*"—Ruskin quotes from St. Paul's description of the unrighteous. Cf. *Romans*. III. 3 In these words Ruskin points out the vanity of human wisdom.

The sucking child...the hole of the asp—Biblical quotation Cf. *Isaiah*. XI. 8. The prophet Isaiah foretelling the restoration of Israel, describes the reign of righteousness which will then prevail. All strife will cease, and, "the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp."

Asp—Small venomous serpent.

There is death...powers of men—Notice this long climax at the end of the speech forming the *Peroration*. There are *three* leading sentences in it, viz : (1) There is death in the *looks* of men; (2) There is death in the *steps* of men and (3) There is death in the *thoughts* of men. Each sentence has its own character of *deadliness* about it, which is amplified with Biblical allusions and so made all the more telling.

"*Their eyes privily set .....poor*"—Quotation from *Psalms* X. 8 King David complains to God against the wicked of the earth whose "eyes are privily set against the poor."

Cockatrice—Mythical reptile, reputed to blast things with its breath or look.

"*The weaned child......Cockatrice den*"—Quotation from prophet Isaiah's description of restored Israel. Cf. *Isaiah*. XI. 8. See note on "the sucking child etc." above.

Their feet are swift to shed blood etc."—Ruskin combines two Biblical quotations: *Romans*. III. 15: St. Paul denounces the unrighteous with the words, "their feet are swift to shed blood." *Psalms* XVII. 11, 12; King David prays to God to defend him against his enemies; for, "they have now compassed us in our steps......Like as a lion that is greedy of his prey, and as it were a young lion lurking in secret places."

The wolf shall lie down with the lamb etc.—An echo of prophet Isaiah's description of restored Israel. Cf. *Isaiah*. XI 6. "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb,......and the young lion and the fatling together and a little child shall lead them." See note on "The weaned child etc." above.

Fatling—A fat calf or any animal fattened for slaughter.

A little child shall lead them—Cf. the concluding part of the

passage from *Isaiah* in the above note. The text is beautifully illustrated in George Eliot's *Silas Marner*,—where the child Effie does lead Silas Marner from his misantropic frame of mind to a more humanitarian one.

Riddle—Mystery.

Lord of heaven and earth......"He has hidden these things ...revealed them unto babes."—In these words Christ denounced the wicked people of Capernaum, Chozarin and Bethsaida, and foretold their punishment on the day of Judgment. But the ways of God are inscrutable to the wise of the earth; only children, because they are innocent, can understand them. Cf. *Matthew*. XI. 25.

Principalities and powers—Echo of St. Paul's words, who says that nothing, "nor principalitites nor powers" can separate the righteous from the love of God.

As far as the east from the west—Echo of *Psalms*. CIII. 12. King David, singing of the magnitude of God's forgiveness, says, "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us."

Sins are not set from us—Our sins are not forgiven.

The sun......rejoices—Echo of *Psalms*. XIX. 5. King David says that the sun who "rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race", bears testimony to the glory of God.

Not with clouds, but blood—Biblical allusion. *Acts*. II. 20. St. Peter describing the wonders that will accompany the coming of the Lord's day, says that the *moon* shall be turned into blood.

The sun that rejoices (see previous note) bears testimony to God's glory. But the sun that is red with blood, Ruskin suggests, bears testimony to God's anger at man's iniquity.

Early and latter rain—An echo of prophet Jeremiah's description of God's anger against the Jews, who were ungrateful to God, who gave them, "rain, both the former and the latter, in his season." *Jeremiah*. *V*. 24. The reference is to the two rainy seasons of southern Palestine.

Red rain—of God's anger.

PAGE 54.

Enemy and avenger—The spirit of retribution: Nemesis, that overtakes crime.

Knitted gun or smoothed rifle—The epithets "knitted", and "smooth" are difficult to explain.

The "smoothed rifle is probably a rifle with a *smooth bore*, or perhaps a *polished* rifle "Knitted gun" *may be* "well-knitted" or well-arranged guns in a battery.

"Out of the mouths........ sucklings...still the enemy and avenger—Quotation from *Psalms*. VIII. 2. David sings how God ordains strength "out of the mouths of babes and sucklings," so that he might "still the enemy and avenger."

Ruskin implies that only spiritual strength can save us from Nemesis ; and such strength can come only from hearts innocent like those of children. Ruskin concludes the speech with a glorification of the innocence, faith, love and joy of child-life. The purity of the child-mind was a note first struck by Rousseau and amplified by Wordsworth in his poetry.

PAGE 55.

LECTURE II.

TRAFFIC

This lecture was delivered on April 21st, 1864, at the Town Hall of Bradford in Yorkshire.

Traffic—Trade.

Town Hall—The municipal building of a town.

Bradford—City and country borough of Yorkshire, England. Noted for its woollen manufactures.

Speak to purpose—Speak to any advantage.

Exchange—Building where merchants assemble for business. The Bradford Exchange House was completed in 1867 at a cost of £ 40,000.

When formerly......audience—In the past I should have been so glad to speak on any subject of architecture to any appreciative audience. Some years before this, Ruskin had been writing on art and architecture (Cf *The Stones of Venice etc*)., but now Ruskin was rather inclined to speak about social questions. And actually he does speak on a social question in this speech, though summoned to speak about architectural designs.

PAGE 56.

Styles of architecture—Ways of designing and constructing buildings. Gothic, Romanesque and Renaissance—these are some of the more important of the architectural styles.

Architectural man-milliner—A milliner is a maker-up or dealer in women's hats, ribbons etc. Ruskin sarcastically invents an odd description of himself, to imply that people considered him as a person who could be called upon to design a new building whenever he liked, just as one requisitioned the services of a milliner to designed a new hat. The phrase "manmilliner" suggests that in Ruskin's days the milliner's profession was confined to women

Leading fashion—Prevalent vogue. Ruskin sarcastically remarks, that, as one might consult a milliner about the most popular style in hats, even so, people consulted him about the leading trends in architectural styles

Newest.. pinnacles—A pinnacle is a pointed turret crowning a roof. Note how the figure about the milliner and the sarcastic tone are maintained. Ruskin uses a phrase which a lady consulting her milliner about a hat etc. would actually use—"the newest and sweetest thing in hats"—only he transfers the phrase to architecture, speaking *not of hats*, but of pinnacles.

All goods architecture...or desire for beauty—This sentence, and the one that immediately follows, sum up the central idea of Ruskin's art of teaching, and indeed, of his teaching in general. The idea is that one cannot, properly, divorce material things from spiritual things ; that whatever is good, beautiful or excellent in the material plane, is only an outward manifestation of the inward excellence, beauty or goodness of the spirit. Applying this doctrine to architecture, Ruskin maintains that good architecture can spring up and flourish only in a nation that is morally and spiritually sound, since all art and architecture must express the character of the nation.

Prevalent—Dominant.
Eager—Enthusiastic
Controverted—Disputed.

PAGE 57.

Dogma—An article of taith.

Taste is not only.........only morality—This idea has been beautifully discussed in *The stones of Venice.* Ruskin means to say : "Taste is not only a measure or a mark of morality, but taste is all that morality is. For the sense of the beautiful—aesthetic perception—is ultimately based on moral and spiritual ideas. Ultimately the Good and the Beautiful coincide with one another."

Tell me you like......what you are—Taste is an index to character.

Unsteady gait—Sign of drunkenness.

Pipe—i. e. a pipe of tobacco.

Quartern—The fourth of a pint.

Canary—A pet bird, named from the Canary Islands.

Hyacinths—The modern *hyacinth* is grown from bulbs, with yellow or purple cup-shaped flowers.

A shy at the sparrows—A throw (of stones etc.) at the sparrows.

Pitch-farthing—A boys' game which consists in throwing farthings, as near as possible, to a given line. A farthing is a copper coin, the fourth of a penny.

So that he does not drink—So long as, or, provided he does not drink.

PAGE 58.

Sunday school—These were held generally to give religious education.

Thirst after justice—Echo of Christ's teaching. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness." *Matthew V. 6.*

Outside ornaments—i. e. as opposed to internal mental qualities like purity, justice etc.

Rightly set liking—Properly cultivated taste.

Teniers—David Teniers (1610-1690) a great Flemish painter of peasant life.

Sots—Men constantly stupid with drink.

"Unmannered" or "immoral"—The two words have ultimately the same sense ; for *moral* (and so *immoral*) comes from the Latin word *mores*, meaning *manners*. The developed sense of *morality* from "good *manners*" arose already in Latin

times for in Latin the word *mores* meaning *manners* is often used in the sense of *character*.

PAGE 59.

Bad taste—The phrase usually means "bad form" ; it is applied to things that "aren't done", indicating transgression of points of social etiquette. But Ruskin uses the expression in a deeper sense, as signifying corruption of character.

Titian—Italian painter ; born about 1477.

Turner—Joseph Mallord William Turner, English painter, 1775-1851. Ruskin admired him greatly, and his work, "Modern Painters" was inspired mainly by that admiration.

Hateliness—Ruskin's love of antithesis leads often to his inventing odd though striking expressions.

Fleet Street—Street in London, noted as the centre of the journalistic life of England.

"*On the Necessity etc.*"—Written by Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson.

Costermonger—Man selling fruit fish etc, in street from barrow.

Newgate Calendar—A local almanac containing weather forecasts, jokes etc. A taste for reading the Calendar would indicate a low level of culture (Cf. Old Moore's Almanac).

"*Pop goes the Weasel*"—Burden of a vulgar song and dance-tune in which the dancer used suddenly to dart under the arms of another dancer on to his partner.

Dante—Dante Alighieri (1265—1321), great Italian poet, author of the immortal poem, "La Divina Commedia."

PAGE 60.

Beethoven—Ludwig von Beethoven (1770—1827) of Germany. is considered to be one of the world's greatest musical composers.

Appreciation of Dante and Beethoven would be a high water mark of cultivated taste.

I wish you joy of your lessons—The expression "wish one joy of" is always ironical, prophesying trouble. Ruskin implies that the attempt to make people, who do not have the necessary background and training, appreciate great literature

doomed to failure. It will only mean courting trouble, without the least hope of success.

Your great English virtue—Ruskin takes perseverance and courage as the national virtues of England, and they are expressed in England's iron manufactures.

Of any consequence—Of any importance.

To cast—Give shape by pouring molten metal into moulds.

Lava—Molten matter thrown up during volcanic eruptions But Ruskin uses the word to mean the molten iron in the foundries.

Volcanic cones—Furnaces in which ore and metal are melted.

Forge—Shape by heating in fire and hammering.

Inferno—Name of a part of Dante's poem "La Divina Commedia," describing hell Fire is an important element in most conceptions of hell; hence Ruskin's comparison. (Cf. Description of hell in Milton's Paradise Lost, Books I and II.) "Inferno" is italian for "hell".

Iron parchment—Parchment is skin, especially of sheep or goat, prepared for writing, painting etc. Ruskin invents this striking phrase, to indicate that the things turned out by the foundries bear an indelible impress of the courage and endurance of the workers who produced them.

The point of Ruskin's figure lies in the fact that parchment was the most enduring writing material known to former ages.

Bearing with......... hell—The vice of jealousy is not solely the vice of England, but of the whole world and is derived from Satan and the devils in Hell. Satan's fall was due to his pride and his pride was excited by his jealousy of God.

Dishonour in your wars—This subject is amplified in the third *Lecture*. Ruskin is probably thinking of England's dishonour in the war in Afghanistan and the Crimea, but still more of her base neutrality during the American Civil War and the war of Italian Independence conducted by Garibaldi against Austria.

Next neighbouring nation—France. The reference is to the Anglo-French rivalry of former times. Since the end of the 19th century however, there has been greater friendlines between England and France, the jealousy now being between England and Germany. But Ruskin is writing about the seventh

decade of the nineteenth century, when the Franco-German War had not yet taken place, and Germany had not started on her great career of conquest, commercial and political.

With mail upon your breasts..... sword loose in its sheath—Trade rivalry, with its scramble for "markets" and raw materials, produces international friction; which, again, leads to a piling up of armaments for "defence".

Mail—Armour of metal rings or plates.

PAGE 61.

Loose—Thereby showing preparedness for fight.

Two great........ earth—England and France, who are in the front-line of European civilization.

Border riders—Marauders of the border between England and Scotland, in former times.

Cheviot Hills—Range of hills in Northumberland and Roxburgshire. They extend for about thirty-eight miles along the borders of England and Scotland The quotation is from Scott's "*Lay of the Last Minstrel*" (Canto I), a poem describing deeds of derring-do of the days of border skirmishes. Ruskin maintains that Western civilization is a veneer, hardly skindeep: that the modern European, in spite of his pretensions to refinement, has lost none of the brutality that marked the border riders of the times gone by.

Your iron armour—Modern armament; which, according to Ruskin, testifies alike to the brutality of the modern European and to the courageous endurance of the workers who help to forge it.

Ludicrou—Laughable.

Fresco—Painting in water-colour on wall etc. before the plaster is dry, thus making for greater durability of the colours. Italy was famous for fresco—painting. The Ajanta Cave paintings in India will rank among the earliest fresco work known anywhere in the world.

Damask—Kind of cloth, of silk or linen, with figures woven in it.

Credits you with—Believes you to have.

PAGE 62.

Spring guns—A spring gun is so devised that when an in-

truder comes into contact with a string or wire attached to it, it goes off in the direction of the disturbance.

That fellow on the other side of the wall—My neighbour over there across the wall. Ruskin is speaking of England and France, but speaks of them as two neighbouring country squires, jealous of each other.

Fifteen millions a year—The amount is insignificant when compared to present-day expenditure on national armaments.

Our traps—National armaments. The point of Ruskin's parable is that the expenditure on national armaments takes up such a large portion of the national income, that hardly any money is left over for the finer things of life.

Bedlam—Popular name for Bethlehem Hospital,—an asylum for the insane.

Christmas pantomime—Dumb show, forming part of Christmas entertainments.

Paints itself red with its only heart's blood—When the nations are covered with the blood that is shed in war.

Vermilion—Bright red colour pigment obtained from cinnabar.

It is something else etc.—It seems to be comic, but is really a tragic matter

Pop-guns—A pop-gun is a kind of toy-gun.

Armstrongs—Guns made by the armaments-factory of that name at Newcastle on-Tyne.

Small birds of state—Weaker nations, which are often bullied by the bigger ones.

PAGE 63.

Black eagles—The bigger nations; the "Great Powers", like Austria and Prussia. It should be remembered that the Eagle is figured on the national standards of Austria, Prussia and Russia. Ruskin has Britain's policy of non-intervention during the Dano-Prussian war of 1864, in mind.

Mark the double negative, "not—neither".

Farther—We should say, "further".

Soldiership of early Greece—See Ruskin's allusion to Thermopylae on page 50 in the preceding lecture.

Late Italy—Ruskin refers to the decadent phase of the Renaissance in Italy.

Visionary religion of Tuscany—Tuscany is a part of Italy. Its capital, Florence, is a great art centre, particularly famous for its great churches, like San Lorenzo, San Spirito, Santa Maria Novella etc. The Medici family, who ruled at Florence, were great patrons of art. Michael Angelo (1475—1564), painter and sculptor, flourished there, while the Raphael 1483—1564) received his early training in painting at Florence.

Venice—Famous city of Italy, situated on the Adriatic sea. Its splendid buildings include the Palace of the Doges and numerous churches and guildhalls.

Elsewhere before now—In lectures delivered elsewhere, as well as in his book, "The Stones of Venice."

Always Gothic... ..Never Gothic—"Gothic" is the name of a style of architecture whose distinguishing feature is a pointed arch, which makes possible great beauty of design. Ruskin points out how his own day he noticed a divorce between art and life in general. People looked upon art and architecture as things that pertained only to certain special aspects of life, and not to life as a whole. But such a view meant a perversion of both life and art; for the feeling for beauty should inspire our entire life, whether working or praying or enjoying, and indeed, our very thoughts.

Phenomenon—Observed occurrence.

Italian style—Also known as the Renaissance style of architecture. The following are some of its features: (a) Abandonment of the vertical lines of the Gothic; (b) Use of pilasters and columns buried in walls; (c) Use of relatively few or high windows. often protected by metal grilles, giving solidity of appearance.

Antwerp—One of the chief commercial cities of Belgium, noted for its Cathedral in the Gothic style of architecture.

Belfry—Bell tower.

Hotel de Ville at Brussels—The town hall at Brussels, the capital of Belgium. The building is in the Gothic style.

Inigo Jones—English architect (1573-1652). The Banqueting Hall, in Whitehall, and Greenwich Hospital, were designed by him. He executed the scenery etc., for the Masques per-

formed at the court of James I, written by Ben Jonson, when the author and the architect used to quarrel about the details.

Whitehall—Old Whitehall Palace, now housing the United Services Institute and Museum, was designed by Inigo Jones on a magnificent scale; but, only a part of it, the Banqueting Hall, which may be seen in Parliament Street, was executed.

Sir Christopher Wren—English architect, 1632-1723. He built St. Paul's Cathedral when it was restored after the Great Fire of 1666.

St. Paul's—Famous Cathedral of London, celebrated for its Dome and Whispering Gallery.

PAGE 64.

Frankincense—Aromatic gum resin burnt as incense especially during religious worship.

Tabernacle—Nononformist meeting-house ; a sanctuary.

Legned—Inscription.

"*This is the house of God etc.*"—Echo of *Genesis*. XXVIII. 17. Jacob, who in a dream saw a ladder set on the earth and reaching to heaven, said on waking up, "This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

To visit his uncle—The reference is to the Biblical story of Jacob, and his journey to the home of his uncle Laban. It was during this journey that Jacob had the dream referred to in the previous note. Cf. *Genesis*. XXVIII.

Wolds—A wold is an open uncultivated tract.

Westmoreland—Nort-western county of England.

Carlisle—City, borough and county town of Cumberland, England.

Moors—A moor is a tract of uncultivated land, often hilly and covered with heather.

Boggy—Marshy ; wet and spongy.

Wharnside—A mountain in Yorkshire.

PAGE 65.

He has a dream......descending upon it—Jacob in his dream saw a ladder reaching from earth to heaven, and the angels going up and down it. It should be noticed that Ruskin gives

us a kind of modernized version of the Biblical story. See *Genesis*. XXVIII.

"*How dreadful......gate of heaven*"—Ruskin quotes Jacob's words on waking up from his dream. Cf. *Genesis*. XXVIII. 17.

Torrent-bitten—Cut across by torrents.

Snow-blighted—Rendered barren by snow-fall which has destroyed all vegetation

Ready for it alway—Echo of Christ's exhortation to his disciples to be ready for the coming of the Son of man: "Be ye therefore ready also." Cf. *Luke* XII. 40.

Guide the lightning—With lightning conductors. The Lightning Rod was invented by Benjamin Franklin.

Shines from the east to the west—Biblical reference. Christ describes how the Son of man will come without warning, "as the lightning cometh out of east, and shineth even unto the west." Cf. *Matthew*. XXIV. 27.

Warping—Misinterpretation ; distortion.

Judaism—Religion of the Jews. Ruskin has in mind a kind of unreasoning ritualism. To restrict the words of the Bible, viz : *House of God*, only to a Church building is to act, like the Jews, without considering the spirit. The Jews were given to a cold formalism.

Temple—Building treated as the dwelling place of God.

Synagogues—A synagogue is a Jewish congregation, or place of its meeting. But Ruskin uses it in a general sense.

PAGE 66.

Chancel—Railed-off eastern part of church.

Aisle—Part of church ; passage between rows of pews.

In secret—Ruskin has in mind Christ's words to the effect that prayer is essentially a private and personal communion with God, and should not be made anoccasion for public exhibition of piety: *Matthew*. VI.5-6. "When thou prayest thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are......pray to thy Father which is in secret." Ruskin alters slightly the words of the original. The substance of the paragraph maybe summarized as follows: A church is, strictly speaking, not a dwelling place of God) Cf. "temple'); it is, rather, a place of assembly (Cf. "synagogue')—a sort of public place. That being so, a

hurch is *not* the proper place for prayer. To go to a church, therefore, in order to pray, is to commit the very sin against which Christ warned his disciples,—the sin of hypocrisy.

Profane—Irreverent.

Lares......Lar—Spirits of dead ancestors who watched over a household—according to classical mythology. They were worshipper in a pious Roman household. The were rather feeble gods, not to be compared with the great gods. The word *Lar* (plural *Lares*) is supposed to be of Etrusean origin.

PAGE 67.

The Seven Lamps—"The Seven Lamps of architecture" by Ruskin, was published in 1849. The seven "lamps" are, Sacrifice, Truth, Power, Beauty, Life, Memory and Obedience. The book is, on the whole, a defence of the Gothic style of architecture as the noblest, and insists on the connection between national architecture and national character

The Stones of Venice—A work in three volumes by Ruskin was published in 1851—1853. One of the themes of the book is the denigration of the Renaissance style and the glorification of the Gothic. Many critics consider this to be Ruskin's finest book.

Renaissance.........architecture—Architectural style that gained popularity during the Renaissance in Italy, in the fifteenth century. See note to page 61 on "Italian style." The architecture of the Renaissance period is usually supposed to commence from 1453, when the Turks conquered Constantinople and the learned scholars had to fly westward for shelter in the Universities of Western Europe. A great Revival of art and letters immediately followed in the West. The word *Renaissance* (French) means *Rebirth*.

Infidels—Disbelievers in religion. Ruskin, however, means non-Christians or heathens.

Exchange business—Matter or affair of the Exchange. Note the touch of contempt.

Infidel..... people—people lacking faith.

Ecclesiastical—pertaining to the clergy.

PAGE 68.

Laity—Laymen, those not belonging to the priestly order.

Commonalty—The common people.

Baron's castle and burgher's street—The medieval castles of the noblemen and the houses of the ordinary citizens, lining the streets of a town.

It was formed by......kings—This sentence is merely an amplification of the preceding sentence. Amplification is an important device Rhetoric.

When that superstition became..... was lost—This is really a beautiful sentence, very eloquent and impressive.

Beautiful madness—A sort of Oxymoron, or figure of contradiction, since *beauty* and *madness* are rather opposed to each other.

Vainly dreamed......vainly raged—Notice the *antithesis*: the *dreaming* and *raging* were both *vain*, and the two were *opposite* acts.

Pined in the cloister—Wasted their powers in monasteries and numneries.

Crusade—Crusades were military expeditions sent out under the banner of the Cross, particularly those sent from Europe from the 11th to the 13th centuries, in an attempt to recover Palestine, which had been conquered by the Muslims, for the Christians.

PAGE 69.

Clerical company—The clergy ; ordained priests.

You can't......nowhere—National architecture dose not develop in isolated effort. It lives in society as a whole, or not at all.

Hieroglyphic —From "hieroglyph"—a kind of symbolic writing, using figures of objects to represent words or sounds, such as was used in ancient Egypt. The word is used in a general sense, as here, to mean any writing which is difficult to decipher.

It is not..... priesthood—It is not mere symbolical writing belonging only to a class of priests, as in Egypt.

Initiated—Admitted to the practice of some secret ritual or occupt cult, like the cult of Isis, Orpheus, Mithra etc.

Legible laws—Plain principles, which everybody can under stand, as opposed to *hieroglyphics.*

Bosphorus—Strait connecting the Black Sea with the Sea of Marmora. It is on the boundary dividing Europe and Asia.

Medieval—Belonging to the Middle Ages, the period between the fall of the Roman Empire (5th century A. D.) and the Renaissance (about 1500).

Renaissance—Name given to the revival of art and letters in Europe during the 15th and 16th centuries. The word means "re-birth."

Stumbling block..... foolishness—The reference is to St. Paul's words, pointing out how Christ was despised both by the Jews and the Greeks : I. *Corinthians. I.2 3.* "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."

PAGE 70.

Diurnal—Daily.

Diurnal, Divine etc—These words are derived from the Indo-European root, *div*, to shine.

Jupiter—God of the Romans, who identified with the Greek Zeus. The name signifies "father or lord of the bright heaven," and consequently the prince of light, hence Ruskin's description of "the revealer."

Athena—Called Minerva by the Romans, was a great Greek deity. She was the daughter of Zeus and Metis (=wise counsel; Cf. Ruskin's description, "daughter of the Intellect"). "Before her birth Zeus swallowed her mother, and Athena afterwards sprang forth from the head of Zeus with a mighty war-shout and in complete armour." (A Smaller Classical Dictionary : Everyman's Library.)

Athena was the Goddess of power and wisdom, harmoniously combined.

Athenaic symbols—Shield, mantles, helmet and spear.

Aegis—shield ; especially the shield of Athena or Zeus ; protective armour ; impregnable defence. Ruskin has this last sense in mind.

Gorgon—Gorgon Medusa is one of the three monstrous sisters mentioned in Greek mythology. Her head was covered with serpents, instead of hair, and had such a fearful appearance that anyone who looked upon it was turned into stone. Perseus, the Greek hero, killed her with the help of Athena, to whom he presented Medusa's head which the goddess placed in the centre of her shield.

Turning men to stone—See note to *Gorgon* above.

Knowledge which separates etc.—Cf Ruskin on the vanity of human wisdom, in the last paragraph of his lecture on "Work." Note the alliteration in "s" in this sentence.

Olive spray—Cf. Ruskin's interpretation of the Crown of Wild Olive at the end of his preface to these lectures.

Dorian Apollo-worship—The Dorians were one of the four great divisions of the Hellenic race. Apollo was the god of song and music, as well as of prophecy.

Athenian Virgin......worship—Athens was the most important of the ancient Greek cities, and the centre of Greek culture. Athena, one of the most important of Greek divinities, was represented as a virgin, inaccessible to the passion of love.

PAGE 71.

Dionysus—God of wine.

Ceres—Roman goddess, identified with the Greek Demeter, the goddess of agriculture and of all the fruits of the earth.

Hercules—Roman god, identified with the Greek Heracles, the most celebrated of all the heroes of antiquity.

Venus—Goddess of love.

Muses—The nine goddesses presiding over the different kinds of poetry, and arts and the sciences are : Clio, the muse of history ; Euterpe, the muse of lyric poetry ; Thalia, the muse of comedy ; Melpomene, the muse of tragedy; Terpsichore, the muse of choral dance and song ; Erato, the muse of erotic poetry; Polymnia, the muse of the sublime hymn; Urania, the muse of astronomy; Calliope, the muse of epic poetry.

Continent energy—Controlled energy.

No remission—One of the leading ideals in the ancient Greek tragedies, was the idea of nemesis, of retribution, following inexorably upon sin.

Religion of comfort—An important tenet of the Christian faith is the belief in the possibility of obtaining remission of one's sins thought repentance. Hence Christianity is a religion of hope, of comfort. Cf. Christ's words, "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."—*Matthew, XXVI. 28.*

Remission of sin—Divine forgiveness for sin after due confession and repentance. Ruskin refers to the Catholic

doctrine of *Confession* and *Repentance*. In course of time this became a mechanical matter. Chaucer satirises it in his sketch of the *Pardoner* in the *Prologue to the Canterbury Tales*.

Melancholy—Cf. Ruskin's advice to people with "long faces" in the last paragraph of his lecture on "Work."

Aspiration—Longing for salvation.

Medieval—Christianity during the Middle Ages.

PAGE 72.

False philosophy—Ruskin refers to a school of philosophy, known as the "Sophists" that rose to prominence in Athens during the days of her decline. Masters of specious reasoning, they could prove right to be wrong and *vice versa*. Cf. Milton's "Vain wisdom all, and false philosophy." (*Paradise Lost*; Book II. 565).

"*Oppositions of sciences*—Ruskin quotes from St. Paul's warning against vain speculation and false reasoning which weaken faith : "Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called." *I. Timothy*. VI. 20.

Selling of absolution—The priests' power to absolve the sinner was unscrupulously abused during the Middle Ages, when pardons came to be freely sold Cf. Chaucer's description of the Pardoner whose wallet was. "Bretful of pardoun, comen from Rome at hoot." (*Prologue :* 687).

Compounding for them—Like a chemist dispensing prescriptions for diseases. Again note the pun ; for "Compounding" has also the meaning of "condoning for money."

B autiful little quiet ways—Ironical.

Low Church or High—The High Church believes in the divine right of the bishops ; the Low Church does not consider bishops as an integral part of the Church.

Tetzel's trading—It was the monk Johann Tetzel's sale of Indulgences that first provoked Luther's protests against Rome, which led finally to the Reformation.

Religion of Pleasure—Attitude which considered the pursuit of pleasure, the sole purpose of life. Ruskin refers to the decadent phase of the Renaissance. Cf. The Cavalier outlook on life in Stuart England.

Bals Masques—Balls at which the dancers use masks.

Guillotines—Machine used, especially during the French Revolution, to execute people. It was so called because of one Dr. Guillotine who first recommended its use. Ruskin maintains that the excesses of the Revolution in France were a logical sequel to the luxury and vice of the Grand Monarchy.

Parthenon .....virgin's temple—Temple at Athens. dedicated to Athena, the virgin goddess.

Virgin temples also............Lady of Salvation—Churches dedicated to Virgin Mary, mother of Christ.

Our Lady of Salvation—Churches were dedicated to the Virgin Mary in her capacity as *intercessor* for man's salvation with Christ.

Revivalist—People of the Renaissance The word *Revivalist* is used because the Renaissance people *revived* the old classical art. Ruskin implies that their idea of beauty was tll-conceived ; hence his use of the expression "of a sort".

Versailles—Famous royal palace near Paris, built by Louis XIII and enlarged by Louis XIV.

Vatican—The Pope's palace in Rome.

PAGE 73.

Tithes of property—Tax paid to the priests for their support. "Tithe" means "a tenth part".

Seventh of time—Refers to the attendance at church every Sunday.

Goddess of Getting-on—Goddess of material success. Cf. Ruskin's remarks on the "game of making money" in his lecture on "Work" : page 22.

Britannia of the Market—Britannia is the female figure, representing Britain. (Cf. The song, "Rule Britannia") Ruskin says that Britain's chief. and indeed only, concern, is with the market-place. i. e. with trade.

Agoraia—From "Agora," the Greek name for the market-place.

Minerva—Ruskin uses the Roman name of Athena for alliterative effect.

Britannia Agoraia—Britannia of the market-place. Note Ruskin's habit of coining phrases, by analogy.

Built to her—Built in her honour.

Acropolis—Rock near Athens, on which stood the Parthenon, Athena's temple

But your railroad etc.—These three or four lines are found considerably altered in the later edition of the book.

She has formed.........as long as you worship her—British architecture is mainly commercial architecture, dedicated to the purpose of making money.

PAGE 74.

Hercules slaying lions—Slaying the Nemean lion was the first of the twelve labours of Hercules.

Apollo slaving etc.—Apollo slew the dragon Python. See note to page 67. "Apollo-worship."

Bacchus—God of wine and mirth. Ruskin refers, probably, to Bacchus' fight against the Titans.

In founding states—For example in the story of how Cadmus founded Thebes.

Hero-martyrs—Refers to those Christians who sacrificed their lives for the sake of their faith, in times of religious persecution.

Master of Christians—Christ.

His dislike of affairs of exchange within them—The reference is to the Biblical story which narrates how once Christ drove out of a temple the money-changers and others who had gathered therein to carry on their trade. *Matthew. XXI. 12.* "And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves."

Selling of doves—See previous note. Ruskin has in mind trade that is free from unscrupulous dealings.

Quartering oneself—See note to page 5, on "quartered".

Spoiling of armour—Plundering an enemy of his armour after killing him on the battle-field

Magnanimity—Possession of a great mind or spirit ; hence "dignity."

PAGE 75.

Feeding the hungry etc—Echo of Christ's words ; "For I was an hungered and ye gave me meat ; naked, and ye clothed me." *Matthew*. XXV. 35-36.

Occupying a country.........armies—Usually foreign regions are "occupied" by expeditionary forces, but Ruskin would have them occupied by forces of merchants carrying gifts—really a heroic proposal. Ruskin is quite serious. But how long can merchants shower such gifts on the barbarians, say, of Africa ?

To get an eared field stripped—To plunder a field of ripened corn. It was common, formerly, for troops to forage the country where they campaigned.

"Carry" them—To "carry" a town or village is to conquer or over-run it. Cf. the expression, "Carry the day."

Witty—Wise ; demanding knowledge. This use of the word is unusual. Ruskin has the derivation of the word in mind : Old English wit=knowledge.

Elements to fight with—Winds, clouds and other hostile phenomena of nature.

Traffickers—Traders.

And by chance—Because a good deal of trade is of speculative character

Knight-errant—Knight roaming in search of adventure.

Pedlar-errant—Phrase coined by analogy with "Knight errant." A pedlar is a person who goes about selling his wares which he carries in a pack.

Ribands—Ribbons.

Fervent crusades—See notes to page 65.

Tomb of a buried God—Tomb in which Christ was laid ; the Holy Sepulchre in Palestine.

PAGE 76.

Give the gospel gratis—There are organizations which distribute copies of the Bible free among the "heathens".

Loaves and fishes—Material gains ; personal profit. The expression is derived from one of the miracles performed by Christ. See *Matthew* XIV- 17-20.

Frieze—Architectural term for a band of decoration in a building.

Pendant purses—Ruskin sarcastically suggests this decoration of "hanging purses", because British commerce did not show any other heroism than filling their purses with gold.

Bills—Advertisement posters.

Partridge for a crest—A partridge is a game bird. Ruskin's phrase refers sarcastically to the British sport of shooting partridges, which he considers to be symbolic of the national outlook on life. In *Jeremiah* XVII, 11, the bird is described as a type of man who makes ill-gotten gains.

"*Perdix fovit quae non peperit*"—These Latin words are from the *Vulgate* rendering of the verse in *Jeremiah* XVII, 11. The meaning is : "The partridge sits on eggs which she did not hatch", (literally, 'the partridge fosters what she did not bring forth")

Her cross—Cross on the shield of Britannia.

Milanese boar—Milan, an important commercial city of Northern Italy, used to have a figure of the boar on its flag.

Gennesaret—Name of a busy town of Palestine, in the time of Christ. Ruskin mentions it as a symbol of trade, but all editors are puzzled over this allusion, since on ungodliness was really associated with this town. See *Matthew* XIV, 34.

Proper—Heraldic term, meaning 'in its natural colouring'

Field—Heraldic term for the surface of a shield with armorial bearings.

Legend—Motto. Mark the biting sarcasm of the sentence.

Septuagint—The Greek version of the Old Testament, in the Bible.

Vulgate—A 4th century Latin version of the Bible.

PAGE 77.

Greek Goddess of Wisdom—Athena.

Agora Goddess—Market-place Goddess. See note to page 10 : "Britannia Agoraia"

Political Economy .....no science—Cf. "*Unto this Last*", the earliest of Ruskin's economic writings, published in 1860-2, in which he attacked the doctrine of professional economists like J. S. Mill. Carlyle too attacked the new science of Political Economy, with its undue stress on competition and free

trade and *Laissez Faire* and its denunciation of all manner of regulation of trade Carlyle and Ruskin advocated regulation in lhe interests of the labourer.

PAGE 78.

Olympus—Mountain range separating Macedonia from Thessaly. It was regarded as the dwelling place of the gods in Greek mythology.

Pelion—A lofty range of mountains in Thessaly, on which, according to Greek mythology, the giants in their war with the gods placed Mount Ossa, in order to climb up to heaven.

Ossa—A lofty mountain in Thessaly.

Make Ossa like a wart—Make Mount Ossa look small in comparison.

Whinstone—Scotch word for a kind of rock.

Greenbacks—United States paper-money.

No......neither—Note the double negative.

Plutus—God of wealth.

Not ciphers after a capital I—Ruskin suggests they care only for ciphers being placed after unity—two ciphers after unity making a hundred, three a thousand, six a million etc. In short they care only for piling up money.

Pallas—Athena, the Greek goddess of wisdom, often called Pallas Athena, or simply Pallas

Madonna—Virgin Mary, mother of Christ.

PAGE 79.

Deathful—See note to page 4. Observe the contrast with "vital".

I was last here—Ruskin's lectures on the part that organic nature should play as a guide to art, appeared in 1859, under the title of "The Two Paths." The second lecture, entitled "Modern Manufacture and Design" was delivered at Bradford in March, 1859.

Undulating—Wave-like in appearance. Ruskin refers to the rise and fall of the highlands and lowlands.

Pleasant bank—Rising ground. Cf. "How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank" (*The Merchant of Venice* Act, V.Sc. I 54.).

Wings—Projecting parts of a mansion at both ends.

Votaries of the Goddess—Devotees of the Goddess of Geting-on.

Gracious wife......beautiful family—Note the sarcasm.

Boudoir—Lady's private room. The word suggests sophisticated elegance.

Steam engine at each end......three hundred feet high—Mark the sarcastic caricature of industrialism.

PAGE 80.

Seen from above—Seen from the heights of a comfortable life, such as the rich employers enjoy.

Seen from below—Seen from the slums of the poor workers.

Number of blanks—A "blank" is a ticket in a lottery, which does *not* carry a prize. In a lottery, the number of those who draw prizes is always very much smaller than that of people drawing blanks.

"*They should take who have the power etc.*"—Ruskin quotes from Wordsworth's poem "*Rob Roy's Grave.*" The lines paraphrase the familiar saying, "Might is right." Ruskin maintains that there is no difference between the marauders of the days of border skirmishes and the modern industrial magnates. Might of body has given place to might of brains ; but might remains the arbiter all the same. (Cf. Ruskin's remarks on bag-barons and crag-barons on page 38 of the text.)

Iniquitous—Unjust.

Nay, but finally etc.—We have to suppose that this is the reply of the capitalist merchants to Ruskin's arguments. Ruskin himself *anticipates* the possible objection that might be raised by the merchants (The anticipation of an objection and replying to it is a trick in oratory) and he proceeds himself to reply to it.

The tone ....writings—i.e. such as *Unto this Last.*

Captains ....work—Leaders in industry.

Speaking with scorn of liberty—The doctrine the *laissez faire* i.e. government abstention from interference with individual action, especially in commerce and industry, occupied an important place in the economic theory of Ruskin's day. It was the practical application of this doctrine that was largely responsible for the deterioration of the life of the workers in the

early stages of the Industrial Revolution. Hence Ruskin's scorn for the liberty, or rather, the licence, that corrupted the industrial world.

PAGE 81.

Delicates—Delicacies.

Solomon—A Biblical character. He was King of Israel. His wealth and wisdom have both become proverbial.

Not only to be .. stones—Not only to accumulate gold for himself but for all Jerusalem.

Jerusalem—Chief city of Palestine, the original home of the Jews.

Royal labourers governing loyal labourers—Notice the words royal and *loyal*. Ruskin is arguing from the original meaning of the words, which are of French origin (viz *Roi*=king and *Loi*=law.) He argues the king should himself be a labourer, a *royal* labourer, and the others *loyal* labourers and both must do their work.

Lord over the means of maintenance etc—Note the alliteration in "m" and "p."

Something else can and will—If the industrialists do not set matters right and do away with the injustices that they have created, revolution will do it.

PAGE 82.

Bolton priory—Ruskin refers to the ruins of a religious house at Bolton Abbey, a village of Yorkshire. Note the Biblical rhythm of the sentence, with its parallelism of structure.

"*Men may come etc.*"—Refrain of Tennyson's poem, *The Brook*.

Warped sense of duty—Mistaken sense of duty.

Modern economist—See note to page 13 : "Modern school of economists."

To do the best for yourself etc—This argument formed the basis of the doctrine of *laissez faire*. It was held that since the individual was the best judge of his own interests, unhampered pursuit by individuals of their own good, would automatically result in furthering the interests of the community as a whole.

Your great Master said not so—Refers to Christ's teaching, emphasizing the idea of service. "And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." *Mark* X 44.

Have our eyes . ...issue—Have our mind fixed on our own good.

Pagans—Non-Christians.

Plato—Great Greek philosopher. 428—347 B. C. See note to page 49.

The last written words—Viz : in the *Critias*. Ruskin takes this Dialogue as the last because it was left incomplete.

PAGE. 83

Atlantis—A beautiful and prosperous isl nd, mentioned in Greek myt ology. Owing to the wickedness of its inhabitants, it was swallowed up by the sea. The story is told by Plato in his dialogue of *Timaeus*,of which *Critias* was a continuation.

Genesis—Origin.

Daughters of men—The Biblical story narrates how wickedness increased in the world, and how "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair ; and they took them wives of all which they chose." *Genesis. VI. 2.* The expression "sons of God" is however vague It may mean (1) the angels (2) or the purest of early men like Noah.

Their spot was not the spot of his children—*Biblical* reference In these words Moses denounced the wickedness of the people, whose corruption had changed them beyond recognition from the original state of purity in which God had created them: "They have corrupted themselves, their spot is not the spot of his children." *Deuteronomy. XXXII.* 5.

Carried themselves—Conducted themselves.

Every wise—Every way.

PAGE. 84.

Prevalent mortality—The mortal or human characteristics (as opposed to the divine) which they had inherited from the "daughters of men", and which gradually won dominant position in their nature.

Human nature exceeded—The purely human characteristics became more powerful than the divine.

Blind hearts—The true ends of life can be perceived, not by the senses, but by the heart that is filled with innocence and love. A "blind heart," therefore, is one that is incapable of realising the finer values of life. Cf. Ruskin's comments on the phrase, "blind mouths" of *Lycidas* in his *Sesame and Lilies.*

Being filled .... power—When they had the greatest amount of material wealth and power.

Iniquity......possession—Wicked lust for wealth.

The God of Gods etc—The great Zeus, who rules gods and men with universal laws.

The rest is silence—Refere to the fact that Plato's dialogue of "*Critias*" is incomplete. The words occur in Hamlet's dying speech addressed to Horatio (*Hamlet* : Act V. scene 11. 369).

The chief wisdom of the heathen —i. e. of Plato.

Spoken........riches—Spoken about this deification of wealth.

Golden image—Gold or wealth that has become an object of worship or devoted pursuit. Cf. the phrase, "golden calf"

Furnace-burnt—The green of the country-side has turned black (owing to the factory smoke) as if the place had been burnt by the factory furnaces. Note the compound expression ; Cf. note to page 7 on "fain-hidden".

Plain of Dura—Biblical reference. King Nebuchadnezzar set up an image of gold "in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon". *Daniel. III. 1.*

Master and faith—Christ and Christianity. The reference is to Christ's words : ' How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God". *Mark.X*. 23.

PAGE 85.

Forbidden also by every etc—Forbidden by saints and philosophers of all ages and climes, who were believed to be inspired.

No more art etc—Note the rhetorical repetition.

Catastrophe—Great sudden disaster.

Hades—Greek name for the lower world ; used as a synonym for hell.

Which are pleasantness etc—Echo of Solomon's praise of wisdom, whose "ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her

paths are peace." *Proverbs*. III. 17.

Commonwealth—Note the pun. A commonwealth is an independent community. But Ruskin uses the word to mean wealth that is shared by all, and is not the exclusive privilege of a few as it is at present.

You will......flesh better—Then you will know not only how to build noble buildings, but you will also be able to build a noble and virtuous nation out of human souls and sinews.

That kind of marble etc.—This crimson-veined marble of human hearts endures for all time.

Indeed eternal—Eternal as the kingdom of God is eternal.

LECTURE III—WAR.

This lecture was delivered in 1865 to the students of the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich.

PAGE 87.

Woolwich—Borough of the country of London. The Royal Military Academy at Woolwich trains officers for the artillery and engineers.

Painter—Ruskin was primarily a critic of *Painting*, but he was also a painter in a small way.

Knightly examples—Code of behaviour of the medieval Knights, who were bound by vows to lead a blameless life, to protect the weak, succour those in distress and uphold the cause of justice and right. Cf. Tennyson's account of the duties of a kinght in *The Idylls of the King*.

Few words—The soldier is a man of action and is sparing of words.

Or even......by you—Or even if the veteran soldier spoke without modesty, you will have to listen to him respectfully

PAGE 88.

All the pure and noble arts of peace etc.—Ruskin maintains that the heroic atmosphere that a war, a just war, engenders, provides a congenial soil for the growth of the fine arts. It is interesting to speculate to what extent modern was would bear out Ruskin's belief.

Shepherd people—A pastoral people like those in Arcadia in Greece.

I have given .....Vene'ian painting—In the second volume of *Modern painters*, Ruskin devotes himself to the praise of Tintoretto. Ruskin first visited Venice in 1845, but Ruskin is referring here to his second visit in 1849.

Tintoret—Italian painter (1518—1594), greatly admired by Ruskin. His real name was Jacopo Robusti.

PAGE 89.

Austrian shells—Refers to the Italian struggle for independence against the Austrians Venice surrendered to Austria in 1848 and Ruskin paid his second visit to Venice in 1849.

Egypt—The civilization of ancient Egypt is one of the oldest in the world. Some scholars place its beginning as early as about 8000 years before Christ

Contemplation of death—The pyramids, the grandest examples of ancient Egyptian architecture, were built primarily as royal tombs.

And of future judgment—i. e. of the Day of Judgment. In the pyramids lay the embalmed bodies of the kings and great men of Egypt, waiting there till the Day of Judgment.

Theology—Science treating of God, His nature and attributes.

Samuel—Biblical reference. Samuel was prophet of the Israelites ; he was also their judge : "And Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life·" I. *Samuel*. VII. 15.

The peaceful life of shepherds—However about 2000 B. C. there did rule in Egypt a *conquering* dynasty of Shepherds called the Hyksos.

All poetry—The earliest Greek Poetry is Epic poetry and naturally deals with war.

PAGE 90.

Apollo is the god etc.—See note to page 73; Classical tradition ascribes to Apollo the invention of ten flutes and lyre. He was also regarded as the god who punishes, and as such, was represented with a bow and arrows.

Wisdom in conduct—Practical wisdom.

Oftener than by the shuttle—Athna, the goddess of wisdom, was also the patroness of the useful and elegant arts, such as weaving. Hence, the weaver's shuttle is one of her symbols. But in Homer she figures generally as a war-like goddess. Her shield is called the Aegis.

Fatal mistake......life —The Greeks honoured agriculture and the pastoral life. In Egypt, agriculture was left to the serfs, descended of former conquered races, and so it was despised.

Borrowed or derived from them—Greek civilization forms an important part of the basis of Western European civilization.

PAGE 91.

Paradoxical—A paradox is a statement that is contrary to received opinion, or seems absurd at first hearing.

Mars—Roman god of war and husbandry . He was considered the father of Romulus, fo nder of the Roman nation.

Wolf—According to legend, Romulus, the founder of Rome and his twin brother Remus, were suckled by a she-wolf, when they were children.

Were practical, not poetical—Were matters of organization, rather than calling for a high digree of imagination.

Pacis imponere morem —To estableshi habits of peace.

Gothic chivalry—Barbarous chivalry of the early Middle Ages.

Dukeships and citizenships—Refers to the time when Italy was split up into a number of more or less independent territories ruled over by dukes and princes, or existing as republics, like Venice. Ruskin's use of "Citizenship" suggests a republic Cf. "citoyen", the form of address used during the French Revolution.

Lombardy—District of Northern Italy. Milan, well-known for its fine buildings, is its capital.

Tuscany—Division of Italy. Its cities, Florence, the capital, Pisa and Siena are famous as art centres.

A single stream—The Po, the Oglio and the Ticino are the chief rivers of Lombardy. The Arno flows through Tuscany

Alps or Apennines—Names of mountain ranges in Italy..

The city whose armies etc.—Ruskin seems to have Venice in mind, whose Doge, by name Enrico Dandolo, led a victorious assault on Constantinople in 1204. There was a tradition of his having been blinded. Ruskin's use of the description "King" is difficult to explain, since the Doge was a chief magistrate, elected to office.

PAGE 92.

Philanthropist—Literally, one who loves men: one who does good to his fellow men. Ruskin has the literal meaning in mind

Toys of canvas and stone—Painting and sculpture Canvas is used to paint pictures on.

The answer is .....price—In themselves they have no value. Their value lies in the fact that they are an index of the highest aesthetic culture of men. As separate products they have no value, but in a combined way are signs of an elevated state of culture and as such they have very great value.

PAGE 93.

Very dreadful—It is dreadful to think that art can flourish only in bloody war, and that it is war that brings out some of the best qualities of man.

Untenable—Not easy to maintain.

Muse of History—Ruskin, making a sweeping generalization, maintains that peace never promotes the things that we value in life, like learning or culture; that, on the other hand, peace makes for "slothful ease" and luxury, leading to decadence. He cites the authority of history in support of his thesis.

Clio is the muse of history. See note to page 68, on "Muses".

Expired in peace—Died in times of peace.

Dragon's teeth etc.—The allusion is to the classical legend of Cadmus, who, on Athena's advice, sowed the teeth of the dragon that he had killed, from which sprang up men called *Sparti* or the *Sown*. Cadmus was by birth a Phoenician and is reputed to have introduced the Greek Alphabet, which is based on the Phoenician. Ruskin is careful to point out that it is not every war that brings out the best in man, but only just war.

Wolf-flock—Barbarian hordes.

Genseric—King of the Vandals, who sacked Rome in 455 A. D.

Suwarrow—1729-1800. Famous Russian general, noted for his cruelty, who won victories over the Turks and Poles.

Borders of Scotland—The border between Scotland and England used to be the scene of incessant trouble, celebrated in ballads and novels, like those of Scott. See note to page 58, "Border riders "and" Cheviot hills." Most of the Border warfare arose from mutual cattle-lifting—the Scots carrying off the cattle of the English farmers over the border, and *vice versa.*

Swiss with Austria—Refers to the continuous struggle of the Swiss Cantons against the Austrian encroachments on their liberty. Cf. The legend of William Tell.

Napoleon—1769—1821. One of the greatest generals of all time. He became Emperor as Napoleon I in 1804 His ambition involved France in a series of wars, culminating in his abdication in 1814, and the subsequent defeat at Waterloo in 1815.

War in America—The Civil war (1861-1865) between the Southern and the Northern states of the American Union. it was fought on the issue of the abolition of slavery. The Southern states opposed abolition and decided to secede. The resulting war ended in the defeat of the South. Abraham Lincoln was the President of the United States at the time.

PAGE 94.

But the creative.........defend—The war that creates art or inaugurates an era of art springs from the love of contest and a restless urge that is a part of human nature. This love of contest and restless urge have got to be exalted into a beautiful sentiment and an enthusiasm for heroic action. When thus "sublimated" they turn into an ideal to do battle with all evil and defend the purity and virtue of the family and the state.

To such war etc.—Note the rhetorical repetition, giving a climax to the paragraph as it closes.

Conscript—One who is compulsorily enlisted for military or naval service. In ancient Rome and Sparta such service was compulsory ; and the continental powers of Europe have resorted to conscription since the 19th century.

Pressed sailor—Sailor conscripted for naval service. "Pressed" is "impressed", forced to serve under compulsion.

PAGE 95.

Sufficing subject of thought—Some subject that will fully engross his thoughts.

But on compulsion—Except when forced by an enemy.

Appointed field for action, and find etc.—Mark the cunning alliteration "p" and "f".

Laborious orders—The working classes.

Pieces in the game of death—War, the game of death, is compared to a game of chess. The pieces in a game of chess are moved about according to the will of the players; similarly in war, the wealthier classes conscript and press into service the poorer classes, and send them about, to get killed, as if they were not living human beings, but merely pawns in a game of chess.

Human pawns—A pawn is a place of least value in chess. See previous note.

Peasant-pieces—Peasants and other poor people conscripted for military service. Ruskin still has in mind the figure about chess play.

Green fielded board—The earth with its patches of green field is compared to a chess-board.

Olympic dust—The dust of the arena in which contests were held at Olympia in Greece, in ancient times. The modern Olympic games are of very recent origin, dating back only to 1908. Ruskin uses the expression to indicate war conducted in a sporting spirit.

Amphitheatre—Large open, circular theatres where bloody fights between swordsmen (i. e. "gladiators") or between men and beasts were shown it Rome. The ruins of some of these amphitheatres still survive, the most famous being the Coliseum (or Colosseum) at Rome, begun under the emperor Vespasian, the largest amphitheatre in the world.

PAGE 96.

Gladiatorial War—War in which we do not ourselves fight but, instead, set the conscripted soldiers to do the fighting for us and get killed, while we merely look on, like spectators at a gladiatorial combat.

The gladiators were professional swordsmen, in ancient Rome, who fought each other unto death, for public entertain-

ment, and their combats used to be staged in huge amphitheatres. Usully they were brought as slaves to Rome and trained to fight with swords. He who survived the fight in the amphitheatre was given his liberty and became a citizen of Rome. besides receiving other rewards.

Set lists—Lists i. e. the arena, arranged for the combats of the knights.

Jousting game—Combat in which two mounted kinghts fought each other with lances. Ruskin refers to the practice of medieval chivalry, when the gallant knights considered it an honour to fight in the presence of their wives or lady-loves.

And do you not shrink etc.—You ladies would shrink nowadays from watching a bloody tournament or a gladiatorial fight But it is very strange that you do not shrink from watching the bloody war-fields of to-day where the best and bravest of the sons of our fellow-citizens are being sent to be butchered, where the fight is not between one man and another but one nation and another,going on for generations.

Heart-interest—Interest inspired by loving anxiety, such as a woman might feel, if her own husband or sons were engaged in the fight.

Draw.........circus—She words *boxes*, *pit* etc. show that Ruskin is still continuing the metaphor of an amphitheatre.

Circus of slaught r—The battle-field.

Myriads—Thousands.

PAGE 97.

Private position and power ....Public place and power—Mark the alliteration and balance.

Footmen—Men-servants wearing livery. maintained by the aristocracy.

Ba:tersea—Borough of London. Battersea Park is a fine open space.

Arbitrament—Decision. The word is rhetorical.

Law of honour—There are certain laws regulating the practice of duelling transgression of which is a social crime.

PAGE 98:

Parchment of your treaties etc.—Note the alliteration in

"p" and "f." Also see note to page 58 : "Iron parchment."

Ghastly ludicrousness—Agrim tragi-comedy.

Greatest of our English thinkers—Thomas Carly (1795-1881). Ruskin quotes from Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*, (which means "The tailor re-patched") Book II Chapter VIII a kind of spiritual autobiography.

Dumdrudge—An imaginary name, signifying a typical village, coined by Carlyle, meaning the *dumb* and *drudging* masses.

Sign you treaties with peasants' blood—Decide political quarrels by shedding the blood of the peasants.

Thirty stone avoirdupois—A stone is an English measure of weight. It varies to some extent ; while the standard stone is 14 lbs. a stone of meat is only 8 lbs. Carlyle implies that the villagers are strongly built men, and can lift and carry heavy weights:

Avoirdupois—System of weights used for ordinary goods.

Dressed in red—Red was the colour of the British army uniform in former times. Cf. "Redcoat" means a British soldier. See note to page 25 : "Scarlet and gold." *Khaki*—is generally used nowadays.

PAGE 99.

Busy as the devil is etc.—The devil is ever busy creating strife among men ; yet these men had no quarrel.

Entirest—Notice the strange superlative, due to love of emphases.

Had fallen out—Had quarrelled.

Sartor Resartus—See note to page 98 : "Greatest English thinkers."

Tournament—Medieval tilting-match between two sides or parties. See note to page 96 : "Jousting game."

Steeple-chase—Cross-country horse-race. Ruskin has on liking for the British aristocratic pastimes of fox-hunting and horse-racing. Ruskin considers that "tournaments" were better than "races" because in the former the knights fought, while in the latter the labour falls on the dumb horse.

Hurdle-races—Races in which the competitors have to clear a series of *hurdles* or obstructions.

Cricketing, crickets—Ruskin's use of these words suggests a lack of enthusiasm for the game, if not positive contempt.

PAGE 100.

Westminster Abbey—Famous English church; is the coronation place of the sovereigns of England. It contains the monuments of most of the great men of England.

Gothic prejudice—Barbarous prejudice. Note the irony.

Soldier of fortune—Mercenary serving any state or person that will pay him.

Back race-horses—Bet money on horses at races.

Cheat him—Do him out of his money at gambling.

PAGE 101.

Fronting—Facing.

Game of wickets—Cricket.

Make up his accounts—Take stock of his past life.

Whatever is rotten and evil in time etc.—Ruskin maintains that war is a test not merely of physical strength and skill, but, even more, of moral or spiritual strength and integrity. No man can fight well unless he is convinced of the justice of the cause for which he is fighting. Games, like billiards, on the other hand, demand no such moral strength. Ruskin's view corresponds to the medieval practice of trial by combat, in which the accused was permitted to establish his innocence in combat against his accuser, the belief being that God would uphold justice by awarding victory to the innocent.

Balancing a billiard-cue—Playing billiards. A "cue" is the rod with which the billiard balls are Pushed about.

The habit......honest men—The habit of living exposed to danger and keeping cool and light-hearted at the same time implies a general life of virtue and honesty and is also a test of honesty.

Got behind the biggest tree—Has got a secure position to fight from

Has got the wind in his face—This is a disadvantage to the fighter.

On those terms—i.e. if you make the battle to depend upon points of advantage like length of gun or a tree at your back etc.

Multiplied......inequity—In this case you do not add the quality of nobility to the battle, but are merely making it unjust and bloody, adding to the horror of it.

PAGE 102.

In speaking......against me—In thus speaking in terms of praise about war, don't think I have quite overlooked the other side of the question.

Mr. Helps—Sir Arthur Helps (1813—1875). His dialogues on ethical and aesthetic questions entitled "*Friends in Council.*" appeared in four series in 1847—59, and earned him considerable popularity.

Counts of evil—Charges of wickedness.

Destructive machines—Weapons of war, like guns. c. f. The word "engine," meaning an instrument of war. Since Ruskin's day the amount of destructive machinery has gone on multiplying In Ruskin's days there were no U boats, aeroplanes, gasbombs or tanks !

National rivalship of inventive cost—Refers to the armaments race of the nations. The best brains of the nations are engaged, in order to invent ever more terrible weapons of destruction. Mark the unusual form, "rivalship".

Beyond......surgery—Such ghastly wounds that the most skilled surgeon could not cure them.

What book of accounts etc.—Strikes the note of passionate denunciation. It is impossible to cast the total of all this sin and suffering. These passionate words of Ruskin apply with doubly concentrated force to the wars of to day.

PAGE 103.

Chemical and mechanical war—War conducted with the use of chemical discoveries (e.g. explosives etc.) and the physical forces applied to purposes of destruction.

The progress of science......destruction—Very sarcastic remark.

Savage's poisoned arrow—The South American Indians used arrows tipped with a poison, called, "curare."

Muller's Dorians—Prof. C.O. Muller of Gottingen University was the author of a learned treatise on the Dorians. See note to page 73 on "Dorian Appollo worship."

Sparta—City of ancient Greece. The Spartans were Dorians. They were a warlike people, who attached great importance to military training and to the ideal of service to the state. C. f. Milton's.

"Anon they move
In perfect phalanx to the Dorian mood
Of flutes and soft recorders"
(*Parad se Lost* Bk I 549-51).

Violence—The Greek word means rage, fury. In the Iliad it is used always in the sense of "martial rage."

Aristodemus—Was a Spartan unjustly accused of cowardice. He redeemed his honour at the battle of Palataea in 479 B.C. in which he fell; having performed the wildest feats of valour.

Isadas—A Spartan hero, who on one occasion fought the Theban invaders of his city single-handed.

Barbarians—Term applied by the ancient Greeks to non-Greeks.

Muses—See note to pages 93

Crete—One of the largest islands in the Mediterranean. At one time the people of Crete were known for their moral degeneracy.

PAGE 104.

To fall well......valour—Not only did they think it proper to fight like heres, but even in death they thought it proper to fall in a dignified manner and meet death with calm courage.

Spoiling of arms—Plundering of the arms of those fallen in battle.

Interdicted—Forbidden.

Con ecration......gods—Dedication to the gods of the arms etc. taken from the enemy. It was a general Greek and Roman practice. The arms thus taken were hung up in the temples of the gods as trophies

The greatest soldiers who prayed to heathen gods—viz, the Spartans.

Christian ministers—Ministers of a Christian state and professing Christianity. Ruskin may also have meant the Christian priests who supported the war.

Sacred crowning......sacred flute-playing—Ruskin is sarcastically comparing the spartan method of fighting with the modern method as seen in the American Civil War.

Sanctified......musical language—Sarcastic reference to the regimental band The favourite air played by the American military bands is the famous "Yankee Doodle".

North American regiment—Refers to the army of the Federal Government and the Northern States of the American Union during the Civil War.

With an odd perversity, Ruskin, like many other Englishmen of the time, sympathized with the Southern states; though one would think that the cause of the North, viz. abolition of slavery, was a just cause, if ever there was one, for war. See note to page 89. "War in America."

For its charge—For its attack.

Bottle of Corinth—Fought in 394 B.C., the battle resulted in the defeat of the Corinthians at the hands of the Spartans. Corinth is a city on the Isthmus of Corinth.

Indecisive Gettysburg—Refers to one of the important battles of the American Civil War, in which the Southern forces under General Robert Lee, were defeated by the Northerners under Meade Gettysburg is a town of Pennsylvania, U. S. A. See note to page 99 "War in America."

Human nature is a noble and beautiful thing—Cf. Hamlet's words, "What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason!" (*Hamlet* Act II, Scene 2.)

Thinking it high .....they thought it—I think human nature is essentially noble and always find it nobler than I expected it: others think it ignoble and they find it worse than they expected it.

Catastrophe—The word is used here in the sense of a downfall, implying deterioration. (Greek prefix cata=down strepho=turn).

The "London"—Ship wrecked in 1866, on January 11th, on its way to Melbourne. Its captain was J. B. Martin. Ruskin must have inserted this passage later on, when revising his work, since the lecture itself was delivered in 1865.

Mate—The second officer in a ship, next under the captain.

God speed you—I wish you good luck!

I will go down......passengers—We have to suppose that the captain put the mate in command of the life-boat which could accommodate only a few and the captain went down with the rest of the crew and passengers when the ship sank. (The point is; the captain did not selfishly try to save himself.)

PAGE 106.

Your creed—See note to page ? Creed is the summary or essence of what one believes—here what believes about "human nature."

Not their nature...now—I dont't mean the ideal nature of man, as in the days of innocence when Adam and Eve lived in Paradise, but I speak of human nature in the average man and woman even now.

Believe... ..sink to that—A person who believes in such a doctrine may well end in becoming a wolf or devil.

Fulfil the law of her being—Act according to the ordinary expectation of human nature.

Infinitude......upon this—In making your decision in these simple cases, you will have decided an infinite a number of knotty points.

You have had false prophets among you—You have been paying your attention to the teachings of many false teachers. The false teachers are philosophers who told that man is essentially a selfish person, like Ricardo and other writers on Political Economy.

Made you upright .....many inventions—Ruskin adapts the words of the preacher in the Bible *Ecclesiastes*. VII. 29, "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions, Ruskin believes that man is essentially noble, though he has sometimes used his intelligence perversely.

My righteousness etc—Biblical allusion. In these words, Job, who was being sorely tried by God, re-affirmed his faith, *Job*. XXVII. 6.

PAGE 107.

As you lower the race, you get cruelty etc.—As you go down from a higher to a lower plane of the human race,

you find men getting physically base and ugly and likewise also morally base and ugly.

Generous, gentle—Generous : from French genereux ; generosus, of high birth, from genus—race. Gentle : French gentil ; Latin gentilis, in the classical sense of belonging to a gens—race. But the sense of noble, found in the Romance languages is not in Latin. (*Etym. Dict. of Mod Eng* : Ernest Weekley).

Royalty......right—Elsewhere Ruskin says : Since no law can be, in a final or true sense, established, but by right, the law-giving can only become a law-sustaining power in so far as it is Royal, or 'right doing.........Throned on this rock of justice, the kingly power becomes establish and establishing......divine, and therefore, it is literally true that no ruler can err, so long as he is a ruler ...etc." *Munera Pulveris* section 113). The word *Royalty* comes Latin *Rex*, a king, from the words *Rego*, to rule or keep right. The Latin word *Rectus* or Right is connected with *Reg and Rex. Loyalty* comes from French *loi* and Latin *lex*, law.

Gunwale—Upper edge of boat's or ship's side.

Incumbent on—Obligatory on.

PAGE 108.

Not captain by divine right etc.—Note the use of contrast and its rhetorical repetition. The words "divine right" refer to the old *Divine Right* theory by which the Stuart Kings claimed that they were kings by God's appointment and had their *Right* from God and were not responsible to Parliament.

Plebeian—Of low birth. The word *plebeian* is usually opposed to *patrician*, the honoured and privileged class among the early Romans. The plebeians had neither honour nor privilege,

Not with......upon him—Even though he was far away from human society too far either to be criticised or admired.

Rather than . .. emigrants—Rather than prove false to his trust. The *London* was evidently an emigrant ship, carrying passengers to Australia.

Your captain by divine right—The King.

Hues of a hundred shields etc.—Of noble lineage. The phrase refers to the colours of the armorial bearings or the escutcheon ; the use of which is a sign of aristocratic birth.

Beneficent or fatal—Because the effects of his smallest acts descend with a spreading force upon all his subjects.

Stately cabin—The royal palace. Notice the *continued metaphor*. Our Indian princes ought to take a lesson from Ruskin, but most of them have not heard his nams !

PAGE 109.

Every rock defensive—Fortifying every rock.

Scatters...ruin—Causes the whole machine to collapse.

Incognisable—Difficult to understand or apprehend.

Wanton—Capricious

PAGE 110.

Widest error—The epithet is peculiarly appropriate, since the Latin root of "error," is "erro" meaning "stray" The centre of the widest error is "the root cause of a far-reaching ruin."

F re-ship—Ship sent adrift to set on fire enemy's ships.

Roed in consumming fire—Refers to the Greek legend of the poisoned robe which was sent to Heracles by his wife, and which burnt into flesh.

There is no true..... save—There can be no higher ambition or power on earth than to be the instrument of helpfulness and salvation to the people.

North and south minds.. Refers to the American Civil War between the Northern and Southern states The phrase here means minds diametrically opposed to each other.

Grant them unanimous—Suppose they are unanimous or of the same mind.

If they are......weaker they are—If being of one mind they pursue the wrong, the larger their number, the greater the evil and internal weakness of the state.

Of no mind—Incapable of thought or will power.

PAGE 111

Multiplying or diffusing itself.—By adding to its territory and population.

Multiplying or diffusing itself.—By adding to its territory and population.

We have not strengthened as yet......America—It is interesting to note that Hismark, the German statesman, is said to have declared, with amazing insight, as it now seems, that the most important fact in history was that America spoke English. At the time Ruskin spoke, how-

ever, there was not much love last between Britain and the American Union. Canada was a source of weakness to the British Empire, when Ruskin wrote these lines.

Encounter......emigration—Face the necessity of sending away some people as emigrants.

God of flies—Beelzebub, described in the New Testament as "prince of the devils". *Matthew*. XII. 24. The name is an adaptation of Hebrew "baalzabub," which means "fly-lord".

In perfect brotherhood—When all the citizens feel like equals and as brethren.

Austria is not strengthened etc.—See note to page 34, on "noble life in Italy;" and to page 87, on "Lombardy."

Precipitant catastrophe—Headlong ruin.

A little group......fools—A small group of wise people out-weigh a vast densely populated area, if the people are ignorant. The point of Ruskin's comparison lies in the fact that the states of South America are very backward in culture and civilisation.

Which gains itself—Which loses not its own soul; which keeps its soul pure. (Cf. *Matthew*. X, 39, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul")

Practical outcome etc.—Practical moral to be drawn from this talk.

No Government is strong.....justice—The strength of a government grows more or less according as it is more or less beneficent and just.

PAGE 112.

Depends wholly......exalting—Depends on how far we succeed in making our influence on India a source of benevolence and uplift.

But as it is at their......helpful and protective—Ruskin now considers the case when war becomes a moral obligation. War for mere irncease of territory is wrong, but there is an other kind of w undertaken for the help or protection of a weaker nation from an invader (*e.g.* Belgium in 1914 or Poland in 1936). In such a case if the great nation does not help the small nation, there is danger of its becoming morally and spiritually dead.

Sophistical objection—Subtle, dishonest objection. The *Sophists* in ancient Greec ewere professional philosophers who taught for pay and by cunning tricks in logic "could make the worse appear the better reason."

Make your......clear—If your heart as a nation is clean and pure, your intellect as a nation will become clear and you can easily see when your help is wanted

Within these last t.n years——Ruskin refers to Great Britain's neutrality during the wars (1) between Denmark and Germany. when Germany annexed the Danish provinces of Schleswig and Holstein and (2) Italy's war against Austria for Italian Independence.

PAGE 113.

Lost our spurs—Disgraced ourselves. Cf. the phrase " to win one's", meaning "to win by valour the gilt spurs, symbolising knighthood."

We have sought—Ruskin refers to Britain's bullying of China and japan. Britain's 'Opium War" with China (1839-1842) was succeeded in 1857-58 by further hoftilities ; and a further campaign followed in 1860. In 1863 the British fleet bombarded Kagosimn in Japan.

We have been passive—Ruskin refers to the British policy of non intervention in regard to the struggle of the Polish and Italian peoples against their foreign oppressors ; at slso to the war (1864) by which Austria and Prussia deprived Denmark of the district of Sleswig. More than once Ruskin wrote to the newspapers, criticising Britain's foreign policy.

Principle of non-intervention—The princple of not intervening in the politics and wars of the nations on the contineut.

Malignant—Inspired by ill.will or malevolence.

Frenzy of conquest—Mad desire to conquer other countris.

Dastardly—Cowardly.

Intruded upon—Thrust upon.

Sentimential school boys Emotional schoolboys.

Make the best of it afterwards—Learn to make the best use of their position and training.

PAGE 114.

Guards—Name of units of the army, noted for special physical and other excellences. Formerly these were regiments

that served as the body-guard of the King. They are now variously konwntas the Life Guards, the Royal Horse Guards, the Grenadier Guards, the Coldstream Guards etc. The uniform of the Guards was more brilliant. Hence the young soldier liked to be enrolled in the Guards.

Counting-house—Building or room devoted to book-keeping ; hence a symbol of commerce and trade.

Peacocky motives—Ruskin implies that a good many go into the army mainly because of their love of gaily coloured uniforms.

The peacock is, probably, the most of showy of birds.

Prosaic and unsentimental—Humdrum ; without any thing sensational about it.

Shelling—Destroying by means of bombs.

PAGE 115.

In a black one—The black coat is part of the dress habitually worn by those engaged in trade and commerce, in Britain.

Forming minds—Developing minds.

Stay scabbaded—Withold from fight.

Fail not in her grasp—(The language continues the *metaphor* introduced by "scabbarded." The *soldier* is spoken of as a *sword*.) Your only duty is to strike when you are called upon to do so

Britmart—Name of the heroine of Book III of Spenser's "*Faerie Queene*". Her victorious adventures represent the triumph of armed chastity over evil. Here Britomart stands for Britain.

If you can......side—If you can trust that the country that employs you as a sword has made no mistake about the matter as regards the policy and the moral aspect of the fight.

Sheathed in darkness—When the soldier is not called upon to fight.

PAGE 116

Cut thongs for it etc.—A thong is a strip of leather, such as is used at the end of a whip. Ruskin says that a soldier's restlessness or ambition can drive him as inexorably as a whip driving a slave. In his case, the whip is not a physical scourge but a spiritual or mental one.

Forced marches—A forced march is a march requiring special affort or exertion, practised especially in the army.

Field-works—Temporary fortifications.

Some press............vines—Some slaves (as in Trinidad and Jamaica) were employed in squeezing the sugar-cane and some were employed in the vineyard.

Some the blood of men—Some slaves, (i. e. soldiers) shed the blood of human beings.

Captivity—Slavery.

The whole duty of soldiers—The expression is modelled upon the title of a well-known work. once found in every orthodox English home, viz : *The Whole Duty of Man*, published in 1658.

You have only to obey, Cf :

Tennyson's lines in *The Charge of the Light Brigade* :—
"Theirs not to reason why, Theirs only to do and die".

PAGE 117.

How say you of your obedience ? How will you be able to justify your obedience in this case ?

Servants of shopkeepers—It is an open secret that national policias are, nowadays, too often influenced by the industrial and commercial magnates. by the "capitalists"; so that questions of peace and war are decided in accordance with their interests. Ruskin points out how intolerable and humiliating such a state of affairs is, or should be, especially to the soldiers.

Ruskin uses the word, 'shopkeepers" to mean the commercial and industrial community in general.

Field Marshals—A Field Marshal is the highest rank for army officers

Exeter Hall—Large hall in London, where religious and philanthropic bodies hold their meetings.

You had no gifts.... Hall—The gift required to shine in places like Exeter Hall is a cheap kind of oratory. Soldiers are generally silent men.

Will you......commander-in-chief ? Will you be pleased to have as your commander-in-chief some person who has made himself prominent by Exeter Hall oratory ?

Beadles—A beadle is a parish officer with powers to punish petty offenders. Cf. Mr. Bumble, the beadle, in Dickens's "Oliver Twist."

Bethels—Bethel is the name of a place in Palestine, meaning "house of God". Ruskin warns his audience against the danger of their being used as mere tools, to maintain "law and order" in the interests of the wealthier classes, and protect their factories, and the churches where they pretend to pray.

Separated........ military power—However, all writers on politics advocate this Separation of Civil from Military Functions. The Separation of Functions is considered the ideal form of government. It is not desirable to have even the revenue and judicial functions combined in the same men.

Mercenary armies—Armies of hired soldiers, especially of foreign adventurers.

Less instant form of error—Error that is not immediately noticeable.

PAGE 118.

Take away......nation............capacity of thought—Ruskin means to say in this long sentence that it is a misfortune to take away the best young men of the best families, who are brave and unselfish and loyal and turn them into steel and make mechanical units of them, depriving them of the power to reflect and decide for themselves, and on the other hand select the most greedy and cowardly men and the most sensual men and put them in authority over the former though they have no capacity for thought.

A soldier's vow..................honour—Really a memorable sentence !

A military despotism—like that of Cromwell in England and Napoleon Bonaparte in France.

Never by talking—Never by democratic or parliamentary methods. Notice, once again, Ruskin's contempt for parliamentary institutions.

The health of any state—The sound government of any nation.

Truly her thoughts......if ever ! There never was a time when England's councils required to be led by heroical men!

Beautiful division of labour—This is said in a very *ironical* and *sarcastic* manner—*not beautiful at all* ! The "division of

labour" was a term invented by Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations*. The term is still used in treatises on Economics. The doctrine of *Division of labour* states that *Production* is increased by dividing the different details of manufacture among different groups of labourers instead of having the same set of labourers to execute *all* the details.

PAGE 119.

A bit of paper—Refers to the newspaper cutting which Ruskin had with him.

Holding forth in one of its leaders—Discoursing in one of its leading articles.

"*Vivid life*"—(Sarcastic) Vigrous activities in life.

Our English sires—Our English ancestors.

Baron Liebig—Justus Liebig (1803-1873). the celebrated German chemist, was Professor of Chemistry at Giessen.

Alembics—An alembic is an apparatus formerly used in distilling.

"*When the whole world etc.*"—Quotation from George Herbert ;

"Only a sweet and virtuous soul,
Like seasoned timber never gives ;
But though the whole world turn to coal,
Then chiefly lives."

(Poem on "*Virtue*," No. 61 of *Temple*)

True power and true civilization consist, not in the possession of material things, but in those virtues of the immortal spirit of man that abide forever.

PAGE 120.

If it be so, then "ashes to ashes etc."—If purely material things summed up the whole of our existence, then the sooner we perished, the better, because there would be nothing left for us to live for.

The quotation is from the Christian burial service. Ruskin points out how, acceptance of the materialistic doctrine would mean that man is no more than his body and raiment.

Gentlemen of England—The audience consisted of young English aristocrats and are therefore addressed as ' Gentlemen of England."

If ever you.........her body—If you wish to have spiritual

life in England and recover that spiritual power which England has lost in this materialistic age.

Blown up .....acid—With its belly swollen with the fumes of carbonic acid gas. If England depends on *coal* (*i e.* carbon) carbonic acid gas will be naturally produced, and will inflate England's dying body, swelling it to huge proportions—that is also a sort of *greatness* !

[*And great that way*]—See concluding part of the above note. This is of course sarcastic

Carcase—Dead body of animal. The word implies contempt when used for human beings. It is usually spelt "Carcase."

While her fields were green etc.—i.e. Before the Industrial Revolution destroyed the health of her people and the beauty of her country side.

Hollow under their feet—Made hollow by mining for coal and iron.

Sky black over their heads—Refers to the effect of the smoke issuing from the factory chimneys.

When the day......of coal—When the day of ruin and dishonour comes upon England, she will have no reason to feel proud on account of her coal mines.

No good soldier......youth—Ruskin says no one who has proved to be a good soldier in his old age could have been giddy and thoughtless as a young man (Ruskin seems to have forgotten Lord Clive !. Such a thoughtless youth might become a good bishop, or lawyer or merchant, but not a good general. He challenges all history to show him a good instance of a great general who was not also a grave man in his youth (Again Clive may be instanced !). Ruskin is of course thinking of great generals like Hannibal, Scipio, Themistocles, Caesar, etc. These men *were* grave and thoughtful as young men. Alexander the great was a passionate man and he died young. So *he* cannot be in Ruskin's mind.

I have no patience......youth—We often hear people talking about the thoughtlessness of young men and calling for our indulgence. Ruskin cannot bear this sort of talk.

PAGE 121.

When every crisis etc.—When all the great events of his

future depend on what decisions he forms at present, what studies he cultivates and what habits he forms.

When all......of an hour !—When all the future joys of his family depend on how he uses his present opportunities and how he restrains his yauthful passions.

When his every .... conduct—There is great truth in these words : every single act of ours may affect the whole of our future. Every act counts, every habit counts in the formation of character and the architecture of our future life. In the later editions, Ruskin wrote :—"When his every act is as a torch laid to the train of future conduct" In this recast version, he uses the metaphor of a mine that is to be exploded.

Every imagination... . or death !—When every act of his imagination may be as a tonic or as a poison—promoting life or promoting death !

Nobly thoughtless etc.—Heroically thoughtless.

A youth thoughtless etc.—Mark the rhetoric of the passage and the repetition of this expression.

Because your life .....other men's—The soldier's life may be shorter as he has to face the risks of war.

PAGE 122.

There is no form......death—Men of other professions may pursue their science as a hobby, but with a soldier, the exactness of his knowledge of any auxiliary science may prove to be a matter of life or death These words of Ruskin have greater value to-day when war enlists the forces of physics and chemistry much more frequently than in his time. Cf. our aeroplanes.

Those who live by speculation—Merchants who make their fortunes by speculating on the Exchange. See note to page 23, on "winning money and making it."

Were there no other ground .....vice—Industriousness has its own positive merits for being recommended to young men; but supposing it had no positive merit, even this negative merit of keeping a young man from gambling would be a sufficient reason in itself.

Not in............rocket—A military officer must know his mathematics to determine the velocity, direction, and curve described by the rocket which he fires.

Lost moments now will be lost lives then—Any idleness in your present day time of study will result in the loss of the lives of the soldiers you will lead in future.

Betting—i.e. Gambling on the race-course and in other sport.

Egotism—self-conceit.

PAGE 123.

Speed of a horse—At horse-racing.

Obliquity of a ball—Refers to cricket, a game in which the cleverest of players may sometimes be "out", with nothing more to his credit than a "duck". *Obliquity*—is a deviation from the straight line.

Consecrated—Made holy or sacred ; sanctified.

Integer vitae, scelerisque purus—Upright in life and free from guilt. Ruskin quotes from one of the odes of Horace, the Latin poet.

Knightly life—Life dedicated to the knightly ideals of purity and service in the cause of the weak and the oppressed.

Because you have to fight......lances—The ancient knights fought with the lance, now we fight with rifles and cannon (since Ruskin's days there has been greater mechanisation of the army.)

Equites—Horsemen or *knights* from Latin "equus" for "horse".

Cannonry—Ruskin invents a word to indicate troops provided with cannon, instead of horses and lances, as the cavalry of former times was.

Chivalry—The word is used in the unusual but original sense of "cavalry" or "horse-troops", Cf, French "cheval" for "horse'. What Ruskin says is even more true in these days of mechanized armies.

PAGE 124.

Is a matter of course—Is a matter that is taken for granted.

Tables of your hearts—Echo of Solomon's proverb recommending mercy and truth to his son. "Bind them about thy neck ; write them upon the tables of thine heart". *Proverbs*. III, 3.

The word "table" is used in the sense of a surface to write on.

Your hearts are......lies buried—There is a godliness in your hearts, but if that godliness is not exercised, it becomes dead, and your hearts become as it were its tombs.

Vow yourselves crusaders etc.—The medieval crusaders dedicated their lives to the redemption of the tomb of Christ in Palestine. Even so, young soldiers must try to redeem their own hearts, in which the human spirit, like some god, lies buried. Thus, in picturesque language, Ruskin exhorts his audience to have noble ideals in life. The "sacred sepulchre" refers to the tomb of Christ. See note to page 65, on "crusade".

Will be so protective of you—Will be able to protect you so well from evil.

The highest law......women—The greatest rule of knightly conduct is the duty of the knight towards women—viz: the defence of helpless women.

Hierarchy of war—Graded priesthood of war. Ruskin wishes to suggest that soldiering is a sacred profession.

Such absolute...strength—Your help to these young soldiers is so absolutely necessary, that without your helpful co-operation, they cannot work in full force, nor even keep their footing.

I know your hearts—This is the concluding part of the speech, which really began at page 120 with the rhetorical impressiveness of the repeated phrase: 'A youth thoughtless!" This concluding part is even more impressive. It is addressed to the ladies in the audience

PAGE 125.

Verily—Truly. The word is archaic.

Through fearful expectancies—Through fearful suspense.

Through the tenfold......joy—Through great agony caused by the feeling that if the son or the husband had not become a soldier, the present suffering might have been nowhere and joy would have taken its place

Yearning......prime—Intense mourning for the death of the dear ones who have died in their youth and who might otherwise have had a glorious career.

To be heroic in dang r etc.—Note the parallel constructions making for rhetorical effect in the Peroration.

It is not in the pining of absence etc.—Mark the alliteration and the declamatory repetition of the word *not*, and the piling up of similar phrases, viz: "it is *not* in the pining of," "*not* in the peril of". "*not* in the wasting of" This accumulation and contrast give intensity of force to the sentence and creates suspense, as what the lecturer means to say is still to come, viz, "that your prayer should be etc" Such a device is quite common in the Peroration of a speech and is a common trick in Cicero.

Guardianship—Watchful protection.

Their own wayward wills—Moral dangers which their will-power is not able to overcome.

Watch you......but temptation—Echo of Christ's exhortation to Peter. "watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation" *Matthew. XXVI.* 41.

PAGE 126.

But it is......reward—This fortitude has its own crown of glory.

If you not only desire to have them so but deserve etc — Note the contrast between *desire* and *deserve* The life and character of the men will be what their ladies *desire*, but only when they toil for it and *deserve* it.

They are but mirrors etc.—The men will reflect the character of the ladies they love. The characters and ideals of man and woman will have the same form and feature.

Frivolous—Flippant ; women of levity.

They will listen . ... . your lips—They will interpret their duty entirely in the light in which you interpret it. (This is paraphrased and *amplified* in what follows).

Quail for you—Fail in their spirits, on account of you.

Mock... . fools for you—If you laugh at their plans, you will cause them a swerve from their purpose and land them in a ridiculous situation.

It is in his heart that she is queen—Ruskin has dealt with this idea more extensively in, "Lilies : of Queen's Gardens, "the second lecture, in his "Sesame and Lilies" It is a favourite doctrine of Ruskin's that woman can be a source of im-

menes moral influence over man. A true wife is an absolute queen over the heart of her husband Over the house she presides as his deputy, but in his heart she reigns as queen and she sways his heart utterly for good or evil.

Whatever of best......find his peace—Very grand finale to this eloquent paragraph, with a wonderful rhetorical balance of clauses, ending slowly on a note of peaceful pathos. Notice the beautiful *rhythm* of the sentence: "From her, through all the......

PAGE 127.

I for one—I for my part.

Cadence of hammer-strokes etc.—Measured movement of sound produced by a smith's hammer forging agricultural implements.

Ploughshares—A ploughshare is the blade of the plough-Ruskin's words echo the prophecy of the prophet Micah about the rule of righteousness on earth, when the people "shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks." and there will be peace and good will among men: *Micah IV*. 3. Ruskin here professes to be a pacifist.

Are too selfish—Ruskin accuses the ladies in the audience of being too narrow in their outlook and of thinking only of their little family circle and never beyond.

Put a period to war—Put a stop to war.

With less trouble .... dinner—The ladies' toilette for a dinner party naturally takes a lot of time and trouble. But to say that they could stop a war in less time is a hyperbolical statement.

Plain obedience—Obedience to the teachings of Christ. Cf. Prophet Samuel's exhortation. "Hath the lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord?" *I. Samuel. XV. 22*. See I. *Timothy*, II, 9.

PAGE 128.

Wear black—Black is the colour of mourning among the Christians.

Mute's black—Mutes are hired mourners at a funeral

Bibles being attacked—See note to page 55 on Bishop Colenso.

To dress plainly—Refers to St Paul's words addressed to

women : 'In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, in shamefacedness and sobriety." *I. Timothy. II. 9.*

Have pity on the poor—Refers to Christ's teaching. "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor." *Matthew. XIX. 21.*

No excuse .... prettiness—Without turning mourning itself into an occasion for a new, pretty fashion.

Downright precept—Plain teaching.

Its whole words—Its entire spiritual meaning.

Do judgment and justice—See *Genesis* XVIII. 19, where it is said of Abraham's children (i.e. the Jews) that "they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment." The chief rule of justice in the New Testament is. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. (*Matthew* VII, 12 *Luke* VI. 21 etc) Ref : the Lecture on *Work*, page 39, where Ruskin discourses on "doing justice."

Their deeds......tossing—Acts of courage without goodness or virtue are merely like the brandishing of a fire-brand. It may cause you to fear it ; but you dont care to praise it.

As is willed by Him—Such just war as is sanctioned by God to promote righteousness.

Prince of Peace—Christ. Isaiah's description of Christ. "For unto us a Child is born... .....and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." *Isaiah.* IX. 6.

"*In Righteousness etc*"—Ruskin quotes from *St. John's* description of God, who is "called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war." *Revelation.* XIX. 11,

IV. SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

(1) Explain the significance of the title of the book. What does the crown of wild olive stand for ?—(See Section-4 Introduction).

(2) Write short notes on any *two* of the following : (*a*) the distinction between useful and uselsss work. (*b*) the distinction between the upper and the lower classes (*c*) The distinction between work and play. (*d*) The relation of production to consumption. (*e*) The distinction between rough and gentle work. (*f*) The future of workmen. (*g*) The merchant's place in society. (*h*) Ruskin's views on the definition and distribution of wealth (See Sections 4, 5, 13 c, d, f).

(3) What has Ruskin to say in the course of his lectures to the capitalists or captains of industry ? (Section 6.)

(4) What did the political economy of Ruskin's days stand for ? On what points does he attack it. (Section 13. a).

(5) What are Ruskin's reactions to Industrialism ? How far do you agree with them ? (Section 13, e and i)

(6) Describe the conditions in Victorian England which inspired the lectures contained in this book. (Section 2, D.)

(7) Examine the view that what matters is not faith in a future life but a wisely ordered conduct in this one. (Section II, paras 10—11 See also concluding portion of Ruskin's Preface)

(8) Discuss the implications of Ruskin's theory that national virtues and vices are indelibly written on national art. Section 10 e.)

(9) Examine the view that architecture prospers or declines with national religion. (Section 10 e)

(10) What has Ruskin to say about the three styles of architecture in Europe ? Has he proved it conclusively that they were bound up with their national religion ? (Section 6, Sec 4, 10 b.)

(11) What has Ruskin to say about the architecture of ware houses ? What is the religion of which it is the expression ? (Section 6.)

(12 Athena, Virgin Mary, Britannia of the Market—what religions do these goddesses stand for and what kind of architecture did they inspire ? Can you suggest the name of the goddess symbolising the religion of the Renaissance ? (Section 6.)

(13) Describe the Temple erected to the Goddess of Getting on and the home of her worshipper. What does the goddess stand for ? (Section 6.)

(14) Examine Ruskin's plea to the captains of labour for determining and adopting a simple order of existence.

(15) Examine Ruskin's theory that (*a*) war is the foundation of all great art (*b*) and of all the high virtues and faculties of men. (Section 14 a, b.)

16 How far is Ruskin's theory about the relation of Art to War borne out by his illustrations of the rise of art in Greece, Rome and Medieval Europe ? (Section 14 b.)

(17) Write short notes on any two of the following :—(a) War as the result of 'proud idleness' and greed. (b) War for play. (c) War for dominion. (d) War for defence. (e) The meaning of power. (f) Kingship. (*g*) Soldiership (Sec. 7.)

(18) What are Ruskin's views on imperialism ? (Sec. 7.)

(19) In what way, according to Ruskin, was Victorian England degenerate ? What are the remedies he suggests ? How far do you agree with them ? (Sec. 7, and Sec. 14 a).

(20) Write an essay on the consequences of a separation of civil from military power. (Sec. 14 c).

(21) Examine the significance of Ruskin's views on war. Do you detect any incons stencies in his argument? (Sec. 14 a.)

(22) Write short notes on Ruskin's views on any *two* of the following :—(a) Taste. (*b*) Childhood, (*c*) Conduct. (*d*) Honour. (*e*) Industry. (*f*) Womanhood. (*g*) Peace. (*h*) Gothic. (*i*) Education. (Sec. 12).

(23) Give a brief account of the substance of Ruskin's teachings in *The Crown of Wild Olive*. (Sec. 16.)

(24) Estimate the significance of *The Crown of Wild Olive* as the work of a prophet. (Sec. 17).

(25) Discuss Ruskin's views on the relation of Art to Morality. (Sec. 9.)

(26) Examine the social element in Ruskin's criticism of architecture as a fine art. (Sec. 10, d).

(27) Estimate Ruskin's achievements as a master of English prose, illustrating your answer with examples from *The Crown of Wild Olive*. (Sec 15).

(28) Write short notes on any *two* of the following :— (a) Poetic prose in *The Crown of Wild Olive.* (b) Ruskin's powers of description. (c) His ironical wit: (d) His love of epigram. (e) His dogmatic over-emphasis. (f) Ruskins's misuse of his eloquence. (Sec. 15).

(29) Examine Ruskin's indebtedness to the *Authorised Version of the Bible*, in style as well as in thought, as revealed in *The Crown of Wild Olive*. (Sec. 15).

(30) Ruskin says that the three lectures contained in the book were "not prepared without reference to each other" What are the common points between the three lectures ? (There is one central idea maintained in all *the three* lectures ; it is that in all spheres of acivity, as workers, employers merchants, industrialists's soldiers, etc, we should work not for personal profit but for public service.)

University Questions

1. Develop Ruskins ideas in any three of the following :—

(a) Taste is not only a part and index of morality—it is the only morality.

(b) Therefore the first necessity of social life is the clearness of the national conscience in enforcing the law—that he should keep who has justly earned.

(c) Your prize-fighter has some honour in him yet.......... But your prize merchant gains his match by foul selling, and no one cries against that.

(d) If they do right, it is no matter that they like what is wrong ; and if they do wrong, it is no matter that they like what is right .

(e) Peace and vices of civil life flourish together.

(f) Remember, that a nation does not strengthen, by merely multiplying and diffusing itself. (For answersee text or summary in the Introduction.)

2 Discuss the characteristics of the three schools of European architecture and their influence on life and religion. (For answer see first part of Lecture II or summary of it).

3. State Ruskin's views on the relation of production to consumption. (See Sec. 13, C. Introduction).

4 Discuss Ruskin's classification of war under three heads. How far is it applicable to present day conditions ? (See Sec. 7, ii ; and also, 14 a.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. *Ruskin's Life and Work.*

(1) *Praeterita*—in three Volumes by Ruskin. Allen & Co.

(2) The Biography of Ruskin by E. T. Cook. Allen & Co.

(3) Ruskin by Frederic Harrison. E. M. L. Series. (Macmillan & Co.)

(4) The Life of John Ruskin by W. G. Colling Wood. (Methuen & Co.)

(5) John Ruskin by Mrs. Meynell. Modern English Writers Series. (Blackwood & Sons)

II. Ruskin's Works.

(1) The standard edition of his works by E. T. Cook.
(2) The cheaper edition of his works by Allen & Co.
(3) Every Man's Library edition of his works and also the C. U. P. edition.
(4) Selections from Ruskin edited by A. C. Benson. (C. U. P.)
(5) *Unto this Last*—edited by Susan Cunnington. The Kings Treasuries Series. (Dent & Sons.)
(6) *The Crown of Wild Olive*—edited by J. H. Fowler. (Macmillan & Co.)

III. Criticism.

(1) *Ruskin : A study in Personality* by A. C. Benson. (John Murray & Sons.)
(2) *Ruskin: A Social Reformer*—by Prof. J. A. Hobson.
(3) *Ruskin : Centenary Address*—edited by J. H. White. house 1919.
(4) *The Cambridge History* of *English Literature*—and Prof. Elton's Survey.
(5) *Studies in Ruskins* by E. T. Cook. (Allen & Co.)
(6) D. C. Somervell : *English Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* (Methuen)
(7) Hugh Walker : The Literature of the Victorian Era. (Cambridge Press.)

